

in taxes and revenues from this. It is a win-win for everyone.

In recent months the Federal Government, the Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife, in an attempt to cut some costs have thought about closing some of these fish hatcheries. I know the distinguished occupant of the chair probably has some of the same problems that we have in the State of Arkansas.

My colleague, Senator BUMPERS, and I held a town meeting near one of these hatcheries. In fact, it was on April Fool's Day, April 1. Truly, we had an overflow crowd. I must say that 99 percent of the people who attended this town meeting on the possibility of closing these hatcheries were extremely bewildered that it was even under consideration to close these fish hatcheries. They are money-making operations for our State. They certainly create revenues for the Federal Government.

Once again, Mr. President, I want to thank my friends for working out what we think is a temporary solution to the closing of the fish hatcheries by making available in this legislation what I consider to be a moratorium, at least until next March, on the closing of any fish hatcheries in our country.

During that time, we will work with the distinguished chairman. We will do everything possible to negotiate and with our ultimate bottom line of convincing those in authority, Fish and Wildlife Service, Members of the House and Senate on committees that appropriate the money for these fish hatcheries, to show them what a win-win situation this Federal fish hatchery program has been.

I thank the distinguished Senator and look forward to working with him over the next several months.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas is most gracious and is the kind of Senator with whom it is a pleasure to work. He makes me want to agree with him.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for about 7 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICARE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to return to a topic which has been talked about and discussed on the floor this morning but which even more intensely will be talked about a lot over the next 3 weeks; that is, our Medicare system.

It is a system, a program that, as a physician, I have been involved in in a very intimate way—as a physician with patients—every day for the last 15 years of my life. I have taken care of and worked, in a doctor-patient relationship, with individuals who rely on Medicare, who expect to have Medicare help them, be with them for the remainder of their lives and for that next generation. But shortly after coming to Washington, just 8 months ago now, there became very clear to me a message which most Americans do not understand—my patients did not understand, Tennesseans do not understand, and Americans do not understand, but it is something about which people in Washington say, “Well, it is not that big a deal,” but it is a big deal for the American people. And that is that Medicare is going broke and will be bankrupt in 7 years unless we act and act now and not just tinker with the system and make some little fine-tuning.

That is not going to do it. We will be in the same situation next year. And what is different this year and the next short-term 2 years is that within 18 months we are going to be spending more in the Medicare trust fund than is coming in, and in 7 years that trust fund will be bankrupt.

We are not going to be talking about less Medicare; we are going to be talking about no Medicare for our senior citizens.

The story is told so clearly, and it is in this little booklet. This little booklet I want every American, all of our Senators, all of our Congressmen and Congresswomen to read. It is the report of the Medicare trustees, the Medicare board of trustees which consists of three members of the President's Cabinet. It says in very clear terms—and let me quote from it—“The Medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its present form.”

It says, and I quote, “We strongly”—the Medicare trustees, bipartisan, including three members of the President's Cabinet—“recommend that the crisis presented by the financial condition of the Medicare trust funds be urgently addressed on a comprehensive basis, including a review of the program's financing methods, benefit provisions and delivery mechanisms.” It is said right here in this book Medicare is going to be bankrupt unless we do something.

Based on these facts, the Medicare trustees urged that the program be addressed and addressed immediately, and the gravest danger to this program and to the Nation's seniors who depend on it is continuation of the status quo and doing nothing.

My second point is that Republicans are responding to this urgent call. It is being addressed straight up front, in very direct fashion. No longer can the trust fund tolerate growth of 10.5 percent. The plan that we have put on the table is to allow it to still grow but allow it to grow at 6.4 percent. Thus, we are not cutting Medicare. It is not

a cut in Tennessee when you are going to spend more next year and the year after that and the year after that, yet we see propaganda coming out from across the aisle and from the White House saying each county is being cut.

Each county is going to receive more in Medicare next year and not less. In 1995, Medicare will spend \$178 billion. In 2002, under the Republican plan, that spending will exceed \$273 billion—a 54-percent increase.

What does it boil down to on an individual basis? It means that this year in Medicare we are spending about \$4,800 per individual; 7 years from now we are going to be spending \$6,700. That is an increase of 40 percent between now and the year 2002.

So let us get our terminology straight. Let us shoot straight with the American people so that we can engage in a dialog that will truly be beneficial to the current generation to preserve Medicare, to protect Medicare and to strengthen the program so that it will be there not just for this generation but that next generation.

I think the message really needs to be made very clear to the American people that, No. 1, Medicare is going bankrupt, and No. 2, that there is something we can do but it has to be a dialog.

Over the next several weeks, we as Republicans are going to continue to listen—to listen to the providers, to listen to the senior citizens, to listen to all Americans, bring everybody to the table so that we together in a bipartisan way can work to solve what is a significant challenge, but it is a challenge we must face because without that the Medicare Program will be bankrupt.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know that the distinguished manager of the bill is waiting for other matters to be brought up. I am just going to speak very briefly on a matter that will be coming up this morning.

There will be a debate on what level of funding we have for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. There is no question in my mind that some would like to eliminate both of them. Some have said this will be a trophy on their wall if this new Congress were to eliminate the National Endowment for

the Arts and eliminate the National Endowment for the Humanities.

It will not be stated quite that way. There will not be a vote up or down on the floor of the Senate or the floor of the House to eliminate them this year because this would not pass. What it would be is a case of dramatically cutting their budgets this year, dramatically cutting their budgets next year and then, like the Cheshire cat in "Alice in Wonderland," it will disappear, only the smile will be there—and not even that. In fact, something other than a smile will be there. There will be the disappointed faces of the people in the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont, in the little towns of Vermont that have had art brought to them in a way that they never could have otherwise except for the National Endowment for the Arts.

These are the towns, Mr. President, when Vermont celebrated its bicentennial, where the Vermont Symphony Orchestra, an orchestra that has received grants from the national endowments, was able to perform in every one of the communities of Vermont. Some of these communities are 38 people. Victory, VT, has 38 people. Burlington, VT, our largest community, has 38,000. It is 1,000 times larger and still one of the smallest communities in the country. But at the very least, at the very least, a soloist was at each one of them, and some of them the whole symphony orchestra was there.

This might not seem like much for those of us who are literally able to walk from here to the Kennedy Center or Constitution Hall or a number of other places to hear wonderful symphonies or watch great plays or listen to some of the noted historians or writers of our country. But we sit here, making nearly \$135,000 a year, able to walk downtown and see anything we want. While these small towns in the Northeast Kingdom, with a per capita income that is one of the lowest in the country, if they are going to see it, it will be with the help of the national endowments, either the arts or the humanities.

The same can be said in all 50 of our States. Historians who have written, educators who have gotten their views to a wider audience through the National Endowment for the Humanities. Art that was available at one time in this country only to the monied and intellectually gifted elite, is now available to all of us. Suddenly those who considered themselves the elite, find that perhaps they were not as knowledgeable as those who had been closed off from the arts before.

We are, as I said, in other areas, the most wealthy, powerful Nation on Earth. Are we going to be the only major Nation on Earth that does not give support to its arts, does not give support to its humanities? I have heard Americans stand up so many times and say, "I am an American. We know what is best." And we look at people from other countries, whatever country you

want to fill in, and say, "Boy, if they only had the advantages we do."

But so many times, these people have the advantages of much more ancient cultures. They have the advantage of the arts and the humanities that are helped by their governments, by their countries. This is not a case where we are talking about the Government somehow sponsoring or directing the arts and humanities. It is all of us, because all of us are the Government—260 million Americans. And we can say to our elected representatives, we want as much of the great arts and the great humanities and the great thinkers and the great geniuses of our country available to all of us as Americans. Whether we live in the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont or in metropolitan New York City or in Los Angeles or in a tiny town in Oklahoma, we can all have it available, at least to the extent possible. And in areas where we are going into wider access, with the Internet on through, we should be encouraging even more.

Now, Mr. President, does that mean that every single artist ever helped, every single writer ever helped, every single musician ever helped is going to be somebody I agree with, or the distinguished Presiding Officer or the distinguished manager of the bill agrees with? Absolutely not. Absolutely not, just as I suspect that during the era of DeMedici, there are those who said that the Michelangelos and the DaVincis and the others of the era did things that they did not agree with.

I think some of the people who even today criticize some of the great American novels of our country, those of Mark Twain and others—we know the reaction in Ireland to James Joyce's writings. We know the reaction in other parts of the world to writings that are now considered classics. We think of the scandal of the Goya nudes. We think of the scandals and the reaction against paintings of people like Van Gogh, who died in poverty. Yet, now we look at them and say what great steps forward. And "Guernica," Picasso's great cry against the evils of fascism, when that first came out people said, "That is terrible." Now whenever displayed, everybody lines up to see it.

So what I am saying, Mr. President, is our country is marked as much not just by our strength and our manufacturing, not just by our strength of the military, not even by the strength of the security of our unprotected but impregnable borders; our strength is also in our ideas, our art, and our accessibility of them to all of us. Not to some ivory-towered intellectual elite, because we are a country that has never put great stock in that. We are a country that puts great stock in our people, all our people. We must continue to make the arts and humanities available to all our people.

I see my distinguished colleague from Vermont and I tell him that when I started speaking, there was nobody

seeking recognition. I thought perhaps we could start this up. So I will yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Vermont are totally appropriate. We are in the process of what I hope will be a successful attempt to work out changes in the appropriations bill to be adopted. I greatly appreciate the remarks that we have just heard.

I must say, Mr. President, I feel like the Grinch. I am here managing a bill in which almost every account gets less money than it does for the current year. And the arguments for each of these programs, taken in isolation of course, is a persuasive argument, one that persuades me except for the fact that there is no free lunch. Every extra dollar for a program A must be taken out of program B. And most of the B's that have been sought so far have been functions which are only funded by the Federal Government, rather than grant functions, subsidies to the private sector, and the like. Nevertheless, I have every hope that we are going to be able to reach an accommodation on this.

The junior Senator from Vermont, who was equally interested in the issue, is here. And so I have invited him and the Senator from Rhode Island to speak to these arts questions while we try to settle an amendment which will be proposed later and which perhaps under those circumstances can be accepted without further debate.

If the Senator from Vermont will withhold for just a moment, I have a unanimous-consent request with respect to the committee report. I will ask that we take up and adopt the committee amendment that deals with the endowment so that an amendment to that will be in order when we get it settled.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement clarifying several provisions in the committee report accompanying this legislation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE REPORT 104-125 CLARIFICATIONS

On page 38, the amount provided for Resource Valuation does not include an increase of \$600,000 for the marine minerals program. The amount provided for marine minerals is the same as the budget request, which is a \$600,000 increase over fiscal year 1995.

On page 46 of the report, there are a couple of corrections to the table for Central Office operations. For the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, the Budget estimate column should reflect "0", the Committee recommendation should be "\$2,168,000", and the Change column should be "+\$2,168,000". For Other general administration, the Budget estimate column should be "\$45,164,000", the Committee recommendation should be "\$34,187,000", and the Change column should be "\$-11,759,000". The totals for General Administration are correct as shown in the

table. The general reduction of \$24,700,000 for Central Office operations is shown in the change column only. The general reduction of \$24,700,000 should be reflected in the Committee recommendation column as well. The total for Central Office operations in the Committee recommendation column is correct and does include the \$24,700,000 reduction.

On page 47 of the report under "Other recurring programs", the Committee has assumed a reduction of \$2,373,000 for facilities operations and maintenance from the budget request and \$2,000,000 from the fiscal year 1995 level.

On page 48 of the report under "Non-recurring programs", there should be no reduction mentioned for pay cost absorption. The reduction for pay costs was taken as part of the resources management and trust activities transferred to the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians and are reflected in the totals for that office.

On page 49 of the report, it is the intent of the Committee that none of the reductions for Central Office operations be applied against the two offices transferred to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs.

On page 80 of the report, a reduction of \$4,000,000 is indicated for fossil energy environmental restoration. This reduction is to be taken from low priority projects that do not present imminent threats to health and safety.

Also on page 80 of the report, except for \$295,000 provided for technical and program management support, the funds provided for Cooperative Research and Development are to be divided equally between the Western Research Institute and the University of North Dakota Energy and Environmental Research Center.

On page 82, with respect to funds provided for program direction, no funds are to be reallocated between the various facilities to implement Strategic Alignment Initiative without prior approval of the Committee, consistent with the reprogramming guidelines, which apply to organizational changes.

On page 86 of the report, the second paragraph and third paragraphs should be reversed in order.

On page 94, the amount provided for facilities and environmental health support is \$900,000 above the House level and \$1,201,000 above the budget request.

On page 138 of the report, there are a couple of corrections to the table for Central Office operations. For the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, the Budget estimate column should reflect "0", the House allowance should be "2,939,000", the Committee recommendation should be "2,168,000", and the change column should be "+2,168,000". For Other general administration, the Budget estimate column should be "45,164,000", the House allowance should be "41,808,000", the Committee recommendation should be "\$34,187,000", and the Change column should be "-11,759,000". The totals for General Administration are correct as shown in the table.

On page 113 of the report, reference to \$27,411,000 for tribally controlled community colleges, Bureau of Indian Affairs, should be deleted since these activities are authorized.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT ON PAGE 95, LINES 19-21

Mr. GORTON. Second, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we lay aside the pending amendment and take up the committee amendment found on page 95, lines 19-21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
Committee amendment on page 95, lines 19 through 21.

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 95, lines 19 through 21, strike the following: " , subject to passage by the House of Representatives of a bill authorizing such appropriation."

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this is the committee amendment dealing with the endowment. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McCain], had objected to our taking that up last night. He has now withdrawn that objection if we adopt it under the same circumstances that we have adopted the other committee amendments. As a part of the overall text, it will be open to amendment. So I do not believe there is any debate on it. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The committee amendment on page 95, lines 19-21, was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BENNETT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, as has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, we are in the process of trying to work out a solution to the very difficult questions of the fundings of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute for Museum Services.

This is critically important because we must make sure that these very fine institutions survive. I am hopeful that we will reach an agreement, which will not make us all happy obviously, but which will allow us to go forward to reauthorize the endowments and to proceed on to conference, where we will at least know from both sides that the endowments will survive as will the museums services.

So I think that is all of our desires. This is a very volatile issue and yet an extremely important one. I note, for instance that this topic of funding for the arts and humanities has made the cover of Time magazine, and the article asks the question as to whether or not this institution, the Congress, will support the Endowments and recognize the importance of that to our Nation.

Let me give us all a little bit of a briefing on where we have gone this year relating to the concerns that have been expressed by Members. They are primarily related to grants that have been approved by the endowments which are considered by the American

public as being less than acceptable, and concerns as they relate to the issue of pornography.

This has been a plaguing matter, and we have tried to relieve the public of anxiety over the years. To a large extent, we have prevailed in the sense that very few items, if any, have come to our attention in recent years that in any way have offended the public.

But under the leadership of Senator KASSEBAUM in our committee this year, we took up the Endowments and reauthorized them. In doing so, we also changed the law such that the chance of having the American public offended by grants for projects that they consider less than acceptable is totally eliminated.

How have we done that? First of all, we have addressed the issue of individual grants, where many of the problems have been. Individual artists are chosen by peer groups to be awarded a grant, and sometimes the grantee, the person who gets the grant, does not necessarily come forth with the kind of art that was anticipated by the peers. Thus, we get into great disputes and embarrassments. As this body knows, we have displays on the floor showing the kind of art that was referred to and the offensive aspects of it.

Under the leadership of Senator KASSEBAUM, we eliminated any possibility of that happening again. The individual grants to artists are limited only to the area of literature. That, in my opinion, goes a little too far, and it may end up being changed. Still, that action certainly responds to those concerns that have been raised.

In addition to that, there have been problems with subgrants and some seasonal support grants where the NEA itself has no knowledge of what is going to be done with funds designated to an institution or for a season of productions. Many times it is just administrative expenses that have been supported by the national endowment. Yet, on the stage, if something occurs which is offensive and because there was a small amount of money that was spread throughout the whole budget of the institution which allowed this to occur on the stage, the national endowments have taken the rap and gotten a bad name. Such examples have been eliminated from having the possibility of receiving funds.

There still will be grants available to individuals at the State level, and there will be a large number of challenge grants. All these things that are presently allowed under the national endowments, all the good works which have not proven to be offensive to anyone, will still will be able to go forward.

On the other hand, unfortunately, due to these unfortunate matters, we have seen efforts to totally do away with the endowments. With that in mind, and without knowing for certain as to how this will come out in the House and the Senate—the thing we want to do today, the most critical

thing, is to make sure that the endowments continue as strongly as possible this next year.

We have in the committee, under the leadership of Senator KASSEBAUM, as I mentioned, changed the endowments significantly and have taken steps to prevent those kinds of embarrassing matters from occurring in the future. These changes were made to protect the public and protect the endowments, and those changes that I mentioned before have now been incorporated into the text of the subcommittee appropriations bill.

So as well as appropriating funds to the endowments, we have changed the current law to prevent the kinds of grants that have, in the past caused a great deal of trouble.

Many of us would like the endowments to receive more money, and in taking the action that we will today, I hope to assure that there will be more money available to those agencies, as compared to what the committee has recommended. This is not the first time we have confronted this type of crisis situation of severe budget cutting. Fourteen years ago we faced such a crisis and an attempt to eliminate the Endowments. We survived and survived with about half the funding. Unfortunately, that is nearly where we find ourselves today. For the endowments to exist, there is a great deal of pressure to try and make sure we do not end up having to account for or explain questionable grants as we have had to in the past.

So I am hopeful we will reach a resolution which will be acceptable to Members and that we will not run the risk of losing the Endowments.

There are a number of Senators who have been helpful. At this time, I would like to yield the floor so that Senator PELL, one of the great defenders and also creators of the endowments, could make his remarks.

I want to, again, pay my respects to the incredible work that he has done in the area of the arts and humanities and the museum services over the years. He kept them alive and strong and has defended them with all the vigor possible.

At this time, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from Vermont for his very nice words and say it was just about 30 years ago that the Senator from New York, Mr. Javits, and I were able to get this legislation through. Those 30 years have gone very quickly. Many things have happened, but I think judgment, in connection with the arts and humanities, has been borne out.

The debate reminds me of a story I know concerning Winston Churchill. In the darkest days of the Second World War when the outcome of the battle, the conflict, was still unknown, a

young staff assistant on the Prime Minister's staff found, to his shock, that the Government was funding the British Arts Council throughout the war. He went dashing off to Mr. Churchill, informed him that he found more funds for the war effort and how extraordinary it was that scarce resources were going for such a purpose when the empire was in the midst of a life-and-death struggle. I am told Winston Churchill turned to the young man and replied, "I remind you, sir, it is exactly this for which we are fighting."

I think this thought should remain in our minds as we discuss this issue. I think we should also bear in our mind whether we, as a Nation, want to be remembered as Athens was or Sparta was. Athens was noted for its diversity of culture; Sparta noted for its armaments, weapons, and warmaking ability. I think we would prefer to be remembered as an Athens and it is exactly that for which this legislation needs us.

Rather than being a subsidy for the rich, one of the primary missions of the NEA has been to encourage the spread of American culture beyond those individuals, communities, and regions rich enough to afford it.

Uncharacteristically among Federal programs, endowment dollars multiply and foster national support for the arts. The early endowment grants drew matching grants of about \$1.5 billion in private, State, and local patrons. It is true that without the NEA and the NEH we would still have our history, literature and art. But these things would be reserved for those who can afford it. I think it is unfair to our citizens and for some individuals to assert that only wealthy Americans are interested in the development of the arts. I know as one Senator, I believe and the evidence supports the fact that Americans from every walk of life, from every economic level, strongly desire to seek access to cultural events in their own home communities.

From an economic viewpoint, the dollars sent by the arts endowment to communities around our Nation have been a very successful investment. For every dollar the endowment invests, there is created a tenfold return in jobs, services, and contracts.

The arts, fostered by the national endowment, encourage national and international tourism, attract and retain businesses in our communities, stimulate real estate development, increase the production of exportable copyright materials and, most important, contribute to our tax base. Governors and mayors from around the Nation can attest to the manner in which the endowment-supported projects have breathed new life into the downtown areas of their towns and cities. New businesses and tourists congregate in those areas which have developed a cultural life. San Antonio, Cleveland, Greenville, Oklahoma City, and Birmingham are among the cities studies

have shown the enormous economic contribution of the arts.

Rather than being a subsidy for the rich, this has as its primary mission the encouragement of American culture beyond any small circle of those able to afford it. It is true that without the NEA and the NEH we would still have a history, literature, and art, but it would be reserved for those who could afford it.

All told, I can think of no legislation that would, for less money, add more to the quality of life for our citizens and our communities.

I hope that my colleagues will support this legislation, and that as the years go on we will have increased it and emphasized it. It has been 30 years since we started, 30 years since on the Senate floor some of us have advocated it. I hope that 30 years from now, down the road, we will continue to spend money on the arts and we will be known as not only a great Nation and a superpower, but known as the Athens of the world, the leader in the arts, humanities, literature, poetry, painting, and the like.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to my friend Senator PELL, who through the years has been such an extraordinary supporter of the arts—music, theater, visual arts, the performing arts. He is an extraordinary man, a gentle man, and a gentleman. And I also pay tribute to Senator JEFFORDS, who must just be listed as totally consistent, totally steady, totally fair as he pursues this great interest of his.

As for me, I, too, have found the arts and music and history and the visual and performing arts to be a very important part of my life. If politics is your sole reason for existence, it is a very barren experience, a rather barbaric experience. For me, the arts and music are the salvation, the softening of the edges of what we do here. And so, throughout the years, I have tried my level best to support these projects and programs, and I do thank Senator PELL and Senator JEFFORDS.

I think this is an excellent amendment, restoring a total of \$17 million in funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and for the Institute of Museum Services, which is a very small agency that does very big work.

I think we have to commend Jane Alexander, a remarkably astute, bright, effervescent lady who knows what the problems of the NEA are and has sought to correct them, and has done a magnificent job of that. Also Sheldon Hackney of the National Endowment of the Humanities knows the problems, perceives them, intelligently looks at them, and has to suffer, along with Jane Alexander, the slings and arrows of an outrageous fortune, especially when he proposes something, I think, as vital as having a "National Conversation," which would be well worth

doing, so that instead of the subterranean dealings with issues such as immigration and racism and homosexuality, we would discuss those things in a national conversation, where people could come into a civil surrounding and talk instead of just saying the most evil thing and writing the most outrageous columns—doing all the divisive things that are done in this remarkable arena.

I think this is an excellent step. I am proud to cosponsor it. The amendment is budget neutral. We would offset the funds, as indicated in the amendment, by striking at administrative costs. Many smaller programs are exempted from this reduction, as is the Park Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We realize those two offices have taken some pretty good shots. It is all there. Many of my colleagues who support the arts may be feeling the pressure in this year of budget constraint. But even if we pass this important amendment, the arts endowments will have taken a very tough hit, a full 30-percent cut—the deepest in the bill.

Without this amendment, State grants at the NEA will be reduced by 30 percent, and “national significance” grants will be slashed by more than 50 percent. I believe that is a very high, very inequitable reduction that does not accurately reflect the usual thoughtful sentiment of this body.

I understand all of the difficulties. I commend Senator GORTON, a steady, thoughtful person, who listens to all of us, hears our pleas, which finally turn into plaintive wails or peals for assistance from on high; and Senator BYRD, who listens so patiently and wisely to all of this, and has, for so many years. He is absolutely tireless and is exceedingly fair in his work.

The fact is, in my State, direct Federal grants from the arts agencies provide critical funding for marvelous institutions that are seen and visited by people all over the United States. There are the Buffalo Bill Historical Center in Cody; the Grand Teton Music Festival, in its 7 weeks of performance in the beauty of Jackson Hole, where we have previously hosted the New York Philharmonic in residence for 2 weeks during our centennial year; the University of Wyoming Art Museum; the Mountain Man Museum; the Nicolaysen Museum, and in Southwest Wyoming; Green River; Rock Springs, all are receiving funding. There are hundreds of smaller programs that we do not see, and these endowments enrich the lives of so many Americans, particularly those in rural communities or “frontier” communities such as Wyoming.

The State art grants that find their way to small towns are also used at schools and local festivals. One found its way into the use of an “art mobile” at the University of Wyoming—my vital wife Ann was so very active in that—where you take original art, such as etchings, water colors, oils, out “on the road” to tiny towns where young

people walk up and say, “What is an etching? How do you do that?”

And you say, “Well, you take a copper plate and either do it in dry point, or you do this by pouring acid in there and that eats those lines out, and then you put ink in there and place paper there, and you press it and pull it, and that is an etching.”

And they say, “I did not know that!”

They might also say, “What is dry point?” “What is gouache?” Those things may mean nothing to some but to a kid, they may fire the imagination. That is what we should do.

People in rural areas simply do not have any access to the many privately-funded cultural institutions that exist in larger cities. Indeed, it illustrates the bizarre irony of the argument that the endowments are “welfare for the rich.”

Just let me conclude with a few of the programs that are supported by the Wyoming Arts and Humanities Council. I will leave it up to my colleagues to decide whether these programs provide “welfare for the rich”:

An Arapaho language immersion program for preschoolers on the Wind River Indian Reservation;

A performance of the Bear Lake Music Festival Orchestra at Evanston High School;

A presentation of Handel’s “Messiah” in Afton, WY, in the Star Valley;

A theater production for people with physical and mental handicaps in Riverton;

“Fiddler on the Roof” presented in Sundance, WY;

Operating support for the famed drum and bugle corps, “The Casper Troopers”;

Concert performances by “The Grizzlies” in Meeteetse, Torrington, Saratoga, and Encampment;

A “Young Author’s” contest at Saint Stephens Indian School;

A fellowship for research on Shoshone Indian history;

A “Centennial Singers” performance in Baggs, WY;

A performance of the Utah Symphony in Wind River;

Musical workshops and a concert at the Chugwater Attendance Center;

Fellowship to research child development at the former Heart Mountain Japanese Relocation Center;

Lectures by biblical archaeologists presented by the UW religious studies committee;

Operating funds for the “Traveling Western Art Exhibit” in Green River;

A Wyoming territorial park exhibit of the first women to serve as members of common law juries;

Support for the children’s theater in Thermopolis;

A jazz festival in Powell;

To bring a visiting artist to Pinedale;

A guest lecture on “The Oregon Trail” in Medicine Bow;

A folk dance performance in Dubois; and

Over 100 grants to elementary and secondary schools for arts in education.

A program at the former Heart Mountain Japanese Relocation Center. That ought to be studied. This is where our fellow citizens were placed behind barbed wire in 1943. They were not aliens, they were not permanent resident aliens; they were U.S. citizens put behind wire. That is where I first met Congressman NORM MINETA. We were together in the Boy Scouts—he behind the wire, and me in the town of Cody. Interesting times. The two of us have shared much together in talking about it and remembering it.

The people who attend these events are not “highbrow elitists.” They are genuine, hard-working, sensible folks whose lives are truly brightened and improved by the work of the NEA and NEH. And today these folks are provided enlightenment in a sea of the present shallowest, coarsest television pop culture of the ages.

People certainly do actively participate in the arts. In the past 4 years, more than 3 million people have attended NEA or NEA-supported events or facilities in Wyoming alone. That is not too bad in a State with only 476,000 people!

Yes, yes, there is always going to be the emotional debate regarding obscenity. We have all seen the grotesque—stupefying, actually—and explicit photographs and listened to the very real concerns of many Members of the Congress. But in nearly 30 years, with nearly 100,000 grants, only a small handful of those projects have been controversial in any way. That is a pretty good track record, a handful of decisions in 30 years. I believe we could find a greater number of mistakes or oversights in many more Federal agencies, or perhaps even in the Congress itself! We just might have made a mistake or two here in 30 years. But that never receives the same level of intense scrutiny. In directing our displeasure, we should attack the cancer, not kill the patient.

The arts are an integral part of our society and serve as a unifying force. We are all concerned about the economy and appropriate use of dollars. But this is a measure that I hope will pass.

I thank again Senator GORTON. I thank all those involved—Senator BYRD. The Interior appropriations bill is all about conserving our Nation’s resources. I deeply believe the money we spend on our culture is no less important than the money we spend on our natural resources, our forests, our animals—the flora, the fauna—and our energy. This bill provides a great deal of taxpayers’ money to conserve those natural riches. We should make a similar Federal commitment to stimulate and preserve fully our Nation’s varied cultural treasures and riches.

I thank the Chair and I thank particularly the managers of the bill for their extraordinary patience and courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, a technical point. I ask unanimous consent the last committee amendment adopted on the National Endowment for the Arts be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I simply want to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington, for the expert and patient way in which he has dealt with this issue. It is my belief the amendment that is going to be offered by the Senator from Vermont is a salutary one. It is one I support and intend to vote for. It is my understanding that it enjoys wide support in the body and will, in all probability, be agreed to.

I want to repeat my own commitment to some kind of national presence with respect to the arts. Senator HUTCHISON and I have introduced a bill that would create a single endowment, combining the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, in an effort to get more efficiency out of the overhead money connected with these efforts. But I believe, for the same reasons the Senator from Wyoming has outlined, that cutting off all significant national presence in this area would be a mistake, and it would hit most heavily, ironically, in the more rural areas.

In the State of Utah we have a long history of commitment to the arts and involvement with the arts. It goes all the way back to Brigham Young, the first Governor of the Territory of Utah, who, in their days of poverty, led the original settlers of Utah to build a theater and to recognize the importance of the arts that early in their lives. That is a tradition I am proud of and that I want to perpetuate here.

I simply want to make the point that Federal arts funding is not sufficient to sustain any of the groups that depend upon it. They all require much more private funding than they get from the Federal Government. The thing the Federal funding does is give, if you will, a "Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval" to the fundraising efforts of the locals, who are trying to support arts in the community. Particularly in rural areas, which abound in my State, there would be a devastating effect on the fundraising efforts of local people if the imprimatur that comes from the NEA were to disappear.

For that reason I intend to vote for this amendment and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to speak today more broadly about the future of the National Endowment for the Arts as opposed to speaking specifically on this amendment. I had earlier thought about possibly offering an amendment of my own which, if agreed to, would have accomplished the objective of moving us in

the direction of privatization of the endowments—both the arts endowment as well as the humanities endowment. For a variety of reasons, I have decided to withhold at this time. If we do bring our bill to the floor, which has passed the Labor Committee, to authorize the endowments, I will probably offer my amendment in that context where I think it would be more appropriate. I also may, at a later date, bring it as a freestanding amendment somewhere else, if I believe circumstances warrant that.

I would like to reflect here, today, a different viewpoint, to some extent, than that which we have heard; specifically, the viewpoint that one can be pro-art, and a supporter of arts, and a believer that the arts are important to this country, while not necessarily supporting the notion that the Federal Government and taxpayer dollars ought to be used to support the endowment, or a similar national entity supporting the arts.

I have given a lot of thought to this, because I do not come at this from the perspective of feeling we should diminish the role of the arts in our society. But as I talked to constituents and watched the debate and read the articles that have been referenced here, I have increasingly come to the conclusion we are headed in the direction, ultimately, that will be a lose-lose for America and specifically for people who support the arts.

There are, obviously, a lot of arguments against the notion of Federal support in general. There is the philosophical question of whether or not the Government has an appropriate role in supporting the arts. I do not wish to address that today. There is obviously quite a lot of division on that.

But we are in an era of limited budget availability for all programs, and while certainly a case has been made by some that the arts, as a priority, should be high on the list, it is hard in an era where we are limiting the growth of many important programs—whether it is Medicaid or Medicare or school lunches or anything else—that those priorities should not come first.

In addition—and quite visibly in recent months, of course—we have had questions once again raised about the funding of art projects or of artists or of entities which sponsor what clearly becomes objectionable expressions of art. And whether it was the eating performances or the more recent Horizons project in California, I think American taxpayers are rightfully upset when they see their dollars being used to subsidize in part or in full what at least is claimed to be art but which, at least to them, is in fact objectionable and in some cases perceived to be obscene.

These issues will not go away. I think we, as the Congress, should try to look at the long-range perspective here, not just the question of whether or not there are \$99 million or \$112 million next year in the endowment's war

chest. The fact is, these problems will continue. I do not think halfway measures will work.

Consider where we are headed. Where we are headed now is in a direction in which we both provide less funding than in the past for the endowments, but with more strings, more hoops to jump through, more restrictions on the kind of support that is going to be provided. It is my belief that this approach will continue to make the money available to the arts scarcer—at least that from the Federal Government. And I believe we will continue to increase the amount of regulations on the endowments in the years ahead, because I think we are probably no more than one or two additional objectionable projects away from a complete elimination of funding.

I think that is a lose-lose situation. It is a "lose" in the sense the Federal support, or national support, for the arts will end in its entirety. And it will happen so suddenly there will not be an adequate time of transition to deal with that cessation of support.

And the reason it will happen is because we cannot, in my judgment, in Congress ever successfully arbitrate the dispute which on the one hand has constituents calling and complaining to us that we should not be providing taxpayer funds for what they consider to be obscenity or objectionable art and on the other hand please the people who are beneficiaries of this, be they the artists or museums or others who say we should not censor the arts.

When Government gets into the middle of providing support and then placing strings on the various grants that are given, we inevitably have, I think, an impossible fine line to try to walk: the line that separates obscenity on the one hand and censorship on the other.

So it is my view that all the intermediate steps, whether it is just giving the money back to private institutions rather than individual artists or just giving the money to State councils or putting a lot of boards and regulations into place, all of these I think are going to appease for a short period of time only. And then another project will come along that people find so objectionable that I think the grassroots will rise up and cause a majority of people in the Congress to say "enough is enough." Indeed, on the House side, I guess that is where they have already arrived.

So what I will be offering, as I say, at some point is an amendment that I brought before our committee, the Labor and Human Resources Committee, an amendment on a reauthorization bill which called for a privatization of the national endowments, a privatization over a sufficiently lengthy period of time—5 years—that would give the endowments an opportunity to make the transition from Government funding to private funding. It would proceed on a slow enough pace I think for the entities to be able to develop

the kind of financial resources necessary to continue to be national entities but to no longer be ones which had either, A, direct taxpayer support; or, B, a lot of Government censorship as part of their day-to-day regimen.

I know that some people question whether or not this is feasible. But the fact of the matter is that today the role in terms of the funding that we provide—that is, the Congress provides—the arts is a very small percentage of the total amount of funding that the arts receive annually. Indeed, it is less than 2 percent. Our \$145 or \$147 million, which was this year's funding level, is just a thimbleful of support compared to what comes from private sources. Mr. President, over \$9 billion in support of the arts comes from private sources.

It seems to me that it is very likely and very feasible that a national entity which would continue to provide the sort of national imprimatur that we have heard discussed here today would be able to raise the kinds of resources necessary to maintain a level of activity at least as vigorous as we currently have. Indeed, I would suggest that a national entity, if it received as much support from the artists and the arts community that we have seen evidenced in this debate, would be able to have even more resources available to support the causes that such a national entity decided to back.

So, Mr. President, without belaboring the issue at great length today, I will be coming back to this Chamber at some point with an amendment which will outline a 5-year plan of privatization. I think the net effect of that will be a win-win: a win in the sense that there will remain a national entity providing the imprimatur of support for worthy arts projects across America; a win for the taxpayers in the sense that those who wish to continue supporting it could make charitable contributions and receive tax deductions for those charitable contributions, but the taxpayers who do not support the program will no longer be forced directly to support such an entity; and I think a win for the American people in general and for the arts community in particular because I believe when it is over and that process is in place, that there will be more, not less, support available from a national source to give those worthy projects the backing they need to remain in existence.

Mr. President, I will be bringing this to the floor sometime in the near future. I look forward to discussing it further with interested colleagues.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is informed that the pending amendment is the Craig amendment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I ask unanimous consent that we set aside the pending amendment so that I might offer my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2304 TO VARIOUS COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

(Purpose: To increase the funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. AKAKA, and Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN proposes an amendment numbered 2304 to various committee amendments.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I respectfully object. I would like for the clerk to read the entire amendment. I want to be sure everything is in there that I want in there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue to report.

The assistant legislative clerk continued to read as follows:

On page 2, line 11, strike "\$565,936,000" and insert "\$564,938,000".

On page 2, line 24, strike "\$27,650,000" and insert "\$27,273,000".

On page 3, line 5, strike "\$565,936,000" and insert "\$564,938,000".

On page 3, line 11, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$44,879,000 of the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be used for administrative support for work force and organizational support".

On page 9, line 23, strike "\$496,978,000" and insert "\$496,792,000".

On page 10, line 19, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$13,442,000 of the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be used for general administration and for the Central Office Administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service".

On page 16, line 13, strike "\$145,965,000" and insert "\$145,762,000".

On page 17, line 14, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$14,655,000 of the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be used for the administration of the Natural Resource Science Agency".

On page 21, line 22, strike "\$577,503,000" and insert "\$577,157,000".

On page 24, line 13, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$25,027,000 of the total amount appropriated for the United States Geological Survey shall be used for the general administration of the United States Geological Survey".

On page 24, line 23, strike "\$182,169,000" and insert "\$181,725,000".

On page 26, line 14, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$32,099,000 of the amount appropriated shall be used for administrative operations and general administration and for the Minerals Management Service".

On page 27, line 10, strike "\$132,507,000" and insert "\$132,216,000".

On page 28, line 6, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$21,024,000 of the amount appropriated shall be used for the general administration of the Bureau of Mines".

On page 28, line 14, strike "\$95,470,000" and insert "\$95,316,000".

On page 29, line 6, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$11,135,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be used for the general administration of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement".

On page 29, line 12, strike "\$170,441,000" and insert "\$170,374,000".

On page 30, line 17, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$4,820,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be used for the general administration of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund".

On page 66, line 15, strike "\$1,256,043,000" and insert "\$1,252,291,000".

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The text of the remainder of the amendment is as follows:

On page 67, line 3, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$271,248,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be used for the general administration of the National Forest System for the Department of Agriculture".

On page 77, line 9, strike "\$376,181,000" and insert "\$376,027,000".

On page 78, line 12, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$11,167,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be used for headquarters program direction and fossil energy research and development for the Department of Energy".

On page 78, line 3, strike "\$136,028,000" and insert "\$135,938,000".

On page 78, line 7, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$6,510,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be used for the program direction of the Naval Petroleum Reserve for the Department of Energy".

On page 78, line 10, strike "\$576,976,000" and insert "\$576,661,000".

On page 79, line 2, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "Provided further, That not more than \$22,741,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be used for the technical and financial assistance management for energy conservation for the Department of Energy".

On page 95, line 19, strike "\$82,259,000" and insert "\$92,753,000".

On page 96, line 23, strike "\$96,494,000" and insert "\$92,000,000".

On page 97, line 21, strike "\$21,000,000" and insert "\$22,000,000".

At the appropriate place, add the following:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used to promote, disseminate, sponsor or produce materials or performances which denigrate the objects or beliefs of the adherents of a particular religion."

At the appropriate place, add the following:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available

to the National Endowment for the Arts under this Act may be used to promote, disseminate, sponsor or produce materials or performances that depict or describe, in a patently offensive way, sexual or excretory activities or organs."

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I want to explain what we are doing here.

Our main concern and main desire and the purpose of this amendment is to ensure that the endowments go forward and that we will have in conference comparable bills which ensure the existence of the endowment and the Museum Services Institute. That is the essence of the amendment though we may have a change in just how the offsets are crafted for the increase in funding—but the level of the endowments will be raised to \$110 million each.

Also, there are two amendments that were added at the request of Senator HELMS dealing with pornography and dealing with the inappropriate depiction of religious items which will be made a part of the agreement.

I am hopeful that by doing this we can lay to rest the fear that many have that this Congress and the Senate in particular is going to step back from its commitment to the arts. Nothing could be further from the truth. And I hope with the near unanimity that we have on this amendment it would indicate appropriate guidance with respect to what is a proper utilization of money from the arts endowment, an issue that Senator HELMS has addressed with his language and indicate as well that there is a desire to continue the operation of the endowments. The endowments will be operating at a greatly reduced level, though our amendment today will put them at a significantly higher level than the House has offered. We will have to discuss that issue further in conference.

I should also like to point out how important the continuation of the endowments is. I will later make a part of the RECORD an article in the Smithsonian from May of this year: "Deep in the North Country They Danced Their Hearts Out," which highlights the important ways endowment funds have been put to use.

Also, as I mentioned, Time magazine had on its cover this week an indication of how incredibly important it is for this Nation to stand behind its commitment to the arts, for a nation without art and without a commitment to the arts, is really a nation without soul. And it is important that that is demonstrated by Congress, in particular.

So with that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators JEFFORDS, SIMPSON, BUMPERS, and others in offering this amendment to strengthen the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

The debate over funding for the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA]

and the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH] is not about making tough budget choices. This is a debate over whether reason will prevail over hysteria.

The Federal deficit is out of control and Congress must continue to make tough choices to get our fiscal books in order. But we are not going to balance the budget by eliminating Federal funding to the arts and humanities.

Opponents of Federal support for the cultural agencies have singled out a tiny fraction of the total grants provided across country as objectionable. I, too, have found several of the projects which received funding personally disturbing.

But since when does Congress eliminate an entire agency for a few bad grants? The Department of Defense would have been abolished long ago if it had been held to a similar criteria that a few bad contracts were justification for closing down the Pentagon.

Federal cultural agencies have unfortunately become political symbols for groups that objected to that tiny fraction of grants. I strongly believe, however, that they are a worthy investment—even in these times of fiscal restraint.

Promoting the arts and humanities is much more than awarding grants. These agencies promote programs that foster the healthy artistic and cultural weave that binds our diverse society together.

I need to look no further than my home State of Vermont to see why we must maintain adequate Federal funding for NEA and NEH. It is easy to review lists of the grant awards that have been made in Vermont or any other State. Such a shallow approach belittles the work done by these agencies. These grants keep our culture vibrant and remind all of those who they touch how fortunate we are to live in these United States.

Let me highlight some of the programs in Vermont and show how the benefits far exceed the minor investment we make to promote the arts and humanities.

The Folklife Center is one recipient in Vermont of a challenge grant from the NEA. The center enriches Vermonters of all ages by displaying the beauty and importance of the artisans and their crafts of basketry, quilting, stonework, slate and granite carving.

Arts programs benefit the entire community.

The Catamount Film and Arts Co. in a very rural part of Vermont, known as the Northeast Kingdom, has earned a national reputation for excellence in programming and community service. The \$5,000 that they receive from the NEA enables them to present over 25 live performing arts events each year.

Over 5,000 Vermonters visited the Rutland Region Ethnic Festival last year thanks to support from the NEA. Everyone enjoyed entertainment and a variety of foods from around the world.

Through a grant from the NEH, the Mother Goose Program promotes literacy throughout Vermont by encouraging parents to read with their children. A special part of this program is dedicated to teen parents.

Mr. President, every program in this appropriations bill is being cut. That is reality. This amendment brings parity to the arts and humanities.

With the additional funds provided in this amendment, both NEA and NEH are funded at \$110 million. This amendment is not perfect. Even at this level, NEA would be reduced by 32 percent and the NEH by 36 percent from this year.

I would certainly like to see funding for the NEA and NEH at a much higher level. More than the numbers involved, however, this amendment is a show of the Senate's commitment to continuing strong Federal arts and humanities programs now, and in the future.

The NEA and NEH are extremely important to my home State of Vermont. And I am pleased to be working with my colleague from Vermont, Senator JEFFORDS, to strengthen these institutions. Senator JEFFORDS has been tireless in his support for the arts and humanities.

The amendment we are offering is about more than the State of Vermont, it is about our country as a whole.

These agencies and the grants they award preserve and perpetuate our national cultural heritage. They deserve our support and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment which would restore a minimal amount of funding to our Nation's cultural endowments and the Institute of Museum Services. I am a cosponsor of this amendment.

I proudly stand here in support of the NEA, the NEH, and the IMS. The cuts in this bill which devastate the endowments will have serious implications on our local theaters, arts classrooms and on the creative voice of our Nation.

Let us not kid ourselves. These cuts are not a result of fiscal restraint. The cost of maintaining the NEA amounts to 65 cents a person. A few days ago, we in the Senate defeated an amendment to the Defense appropriations bill that would have eliminated the \$7 billion increase over the budget request. Seven billion dollars.

Some may say that we need these funds to boost readiness. Mr. President, some may not know that the Department of Defense spends more money on military bands than we appropriate for the NEA. In fiscal year 1995, the Department was appropriated \$179.5 million. That is over \$10 million more than was appropriated for the NEA in fiscal year 1995, and almost twice as much as is appropriated for the NEA in this bill.

Opponents of the NEA, NEH, and the IMS contend that Government should not fund the arts.

Perhaps the entities should be privatized. Mr. President, military

bands play for free, with no private cost share. On the other hand, every Endowment dollar attracts \$11 for the arts from State, regional and local arts agencies, foundations, corporations, businesses, and individuals.

Now, I am not against military bands. But to claim that the NEA receives too much money while the military receives almost twice as much for military bands reflects skewed priorities.

I am a longtime supporter of the Endowments. I fully believe that the arts and humanities reflect and shape what we are as a nation.

It is not just the Lincoln Centers, the New Jersey Performing Arts Centers, the McCarter Theaters—it is a schoolchild's first exposure to creativity when he or she writes a poem or a story or draws a picture in class.

It is their enchantment at hearing their first opera on a fifth grade field trip. It is their joy in performing in their grade school play or their high school production.

It is the joy of millions who see productions from the smallest community theaters to Broadway, from the church pageant to the Mark Taper Forum in LA; from the band that plays in the local municipal Fourth of July parade to the Tyrone Guthrie Playhouse in Minneapolis.

It is how America is represented to the rest of the world. It is how America reaches the rest of the world.

These are our Shakespeares, our Maya Angelous, our Mary Cassats, our Dizzy Gillespies and Count Basies and Lionel Hamptons; our Whitney Houstons, and our Jane Alexanders whose achievements will never enlighten and enchant and allow generations to dream if we eliminate the funding.

In the name of budget cutting we will be killing off a vital part of what we are. What we spend on the arts now is minuscule compared to the return. The arts are our past, our present, and our future. They are our collective memory and our collective dream.

Mr. President, I have heard from hundreds of New Jerseyans on the NEA and the NEH. The level of support for the NEA and NEH is overwhelming. Let me relay to the Senate selections from a few of those letters:

I am an eleven year old music student. My father has told me that throughout history, almost all civilized governments have supported the arts.

I feel it would be a tragedy for this country, the greatest in human history, to abandon the arts, and allow much beauty to wither away.

How can we contemplate eliminating these cultural necessities while still pretending to be a great, mature nation? The more we cut, the more careful we must be in order not to lose what is valuable. Wholesale slash-and-burn is no substitute for intelligent government.

One of the reasons I love living in New Jersey is indeed for the easy availability of the arts here. For a country that prides itself on

freedom of speech and a diversity of points of view, it is only fitting that the nation as a whole would act as an arts patron. This is hardly a novel idea—the other industrialized nations subsidize their arts and artists at far higher rates than we do.

Please don't let the NEA die. Let our elected leaders help to leave a legacy to future generations.

Help these generations become the enlightened, enriched citizens of tomorrow.

Mr. President, my constituents say it better than I do. Support this meager increase in funding for the NEA, the NEH, and the IMS. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I see my colleague and friend, Senator PELL, who was the prime sponsor for the legislation establishing these programs 30 years ago. I commend his vision and believe that the record of these agencies is a tremendous tribute to him.

We have had over the period of recent weeks and months a relentless assault on the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. I think many of us across this country understand the importance of these agencies. They are deserving of our support because they make an enormous difference in the quality of life of our Nation—and, most importantly, in our culture, helping to define the context of our history and our society. If we do not understand the humanities, we really fail to understand the individual aspects of our culture, and the unique aspects and values of our society.

Although the funding levels for these agencies are modest, the achievements of this program have been extraordinary over any careful and honest examination of its history. The National Endowment for the Arts is the principle way that the Federal Government demonstrates the Nation's appreciation of and respect for the arts. Every great civilization from recorded times has valued the arts and valued the humanities. The legacy of the Endowments is extraordinary. Small communities and countless neighborhoods have benefited in a variety of different ways, further encouraging as the Endowments support programs and performances in theater, music, dance, poetry, and painting.

We do not have to mention at this time the list of writers and painters, those individuals whose creative energy and expression have enriched the Nation, achieved the top tier of recognition and accomplishment, and look back with pride and gratitude to Endowment support in their early years of development.

The Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Senator LEAHY, along with Senator PELL and others, have been the workhorses in the effort to enact this legislation. I think all of us are grateful for all they have done.

There are provisions included in this compromise amendment which I my-

self would oppose if they were offered as individual amendments. I continue to oppose any attempt to impose content restrictions on the grant-making process and hope that they will not be ultimately agreed to. Nonetheless, I also hope that adoption of this amendment is a clear indication of support for the arts and that the Endowments are here to stay.

We will have an opportunity to fight another day to enhance their accessibility and availability to millions of our citizens. But clearly with the acceptance of this amendment the NEA and the NEH will continue to function and enrich the lives of millions of American citizens.

The funding levels approved in the amendment are a significant increase over those approved by the House. I am pleased that we have been able to improve that level of support and, as I stated earlier, affirm our strong support for the continued existence of these agencies that contribute in such a meaningful way, to our American way of life.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield just for a moment, I compliment the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Massachusetts and others, the Senator from Wyoming, the distinguished chairman and others, who have worked closely, the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Rhode Island. I commend them very highly. It has been a very, very difficult time getting this far, and I hope we will see next year a chance to increase these funds once again. But I think it is absolutely essential we save these two endowments.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Will my senior colleague yield?

Mr. LEAHY. I yield.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I thank my senior colleague from Vermont for the effort he has put in over the years in this matter. We have worked very closely on this, and I can assure you that back in Vermont it is no political liability to do what we are doing here today as our State is very much involved in the arts and maintaining them. I know there are others who wish to speak. I know the junior Senator from Texas is here, and so I yield the floor at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

I rise to speak in favor of the amendment because I agree with many of those who have spoken so far that we are a nation that should be committed to the American culture, and it should be a priority. I should like to speak from personal experience.

I grew up in La Marque, TX, a town of 15,000. Now, obviously we did not have cultural centers in La Marque, TX, but because of the NEA and because of the commitment that we have in America to making sure our young

people do have the ability to have access to the arts, I was able to go 35 miles to Houston, TX, to see the ballet, to see the opera, to see the symphony. And from that, I received an awareness of a very important performing arts culture that I would not have had as a young girl in a very small town.

That is duplicated all over this country. In Abilene, TX, a town of under 50,000, they now have a burgeoning opera helped by the NEA, and just this past month they performed "La Traviata," and it was a sellout at every performance.

Do we have problems with the NEA? Absolutely, we do. We all acknowledge that there are problems with the way things have been handled where taxpayers have been required to fund offensive art.

Is the answer to do away with the American commitment to our culture? Absolutely not. What we must do is make sure we are funding what is uniquely American and what is educational for young people from small towns as well as young people in our inner cities about what is good in the world.

An appreciation of the arts is a very important part of overall education. Senator BENNETT of Utah and myself came up with a new bill to reorganize the NEA. Senator JEFFORDS and Senator KASSEBAUM came up with other ways to reorganize the NEA. Each is coming at this in a different way but not in such a different way that we will not be able to make some changes to improve the NEA, the NEH, and our museum services so that they will be available for more people in our country and so that we also will be able to keep the national treasures such as we have in Washington and New York. I think we can come up with a fair allocation.

In our bill that Senator BENNETT spoke about earlier today, we make sure that the funding goes to organizations of the arts, not to individual artists that might do things that would offend the conscience of mainstream America. We also have an outright ban of any kind of obscenity, pornography or anything that would violate the standards of common decency. Some people in the arts community like to say, "Oh, but you cannot define decency. That would be too hard. That would offend our artistic license."

I could not disagree more. There is a standard of common decency. And when we are using American taxpayer dollars, I think we can easily determine what should be used for arts appreciation and what is inappropriate. Do those people have a right to go out and use private funds to have their interpretation of art? Absolutely. But do we have to have Government funding of that? No.

I think we can make a clear distinction with American taxpayer dollars. So, yes, we have some problems. But we can face those problems without giving up the commitment to Ameri-

ca's culture and to educate our children about the importance of appreciating the opera, appreciating our art museums, appreciating symphonies, and the ballet. Because I grew up in a town that was close to Houston where we had regional art centers, I was able to go to Houston every Saturday morning and participate in the Houston Youth Symphony ballet. So I had the opportunity to perform, to have access to this kind of very important part of my education.

I want to make sure that the young girls and boys growing up all over our country have regional centers and that we have a commitment to that so that they will grow up to be able to appreciate and understand the importance of arts in our country.

I want to end with a quote from John Ruskin, the great British art historian of the last century, who set down the standard for nations when he wrote, "Great nations write their autobiographies in three manuscripts: the book of their deeds, the book of their words, and the book of their art."

Mr. President, I want to make sure that we have the book of art and the book of words along with our great standard of deeds in this country for our future generations to appreciate. And that is the purpose of this amendment and the purpose of Senator BENNETT and myself working with Senator JEFFORDS and Senator KASSEBAUM to make sure that the NEA does what our standards would require that they do; and that is, provide the support for the excellence in the arts for our future generations to be able to have the access that we would like for them to have.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to ask the gallery not show any signs of approval or disapproval to any statement.

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I want to first compliment the Senators from Vermont for offering this amendment. And I intend to vote for it, but not with much relish. The reason I am not voting for it with much relish is because it still leaves the National Endowment of the Arts [NEA] and the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH] terribly underfunded.

There is not anything wrong with this country and there is not anything wrong with Congress except our priorities. We can balance the budget by the year 2002. We could educate our children. We could teach humanities and the arts. We could become a much more civilized nation. But you cannot do that and take care of all these other things that are mostly political. For example, Congress is proposing to spend \$7 billion more on defense than even the Defense Department asked for. And people are almost afraid be-

cause they do not want to go home and say they voted against the defense bill, they do not want their opponent to say they are weak on defense.

A lot of times I think—and I do not mean this to be demeaning of my colleagues—that one of the reasons people cast irresponsible votes around here is because it is easy, it is easy not to have to go home and explain a controversial vote. How many times do you read almost daily how people wish Congress would gather up their nerve and do the right thing? You know what that means? That means doing things that are controversial and that you have to give an accounting for.

I have cast my share of controversial votes, and it gets me in a lot of hot water. For example, I am not going to vote for a school prayer amendment to the Constitution. I am for prayer in school but not for tinkering with the Constitution. I am not going to vote for the flag desecration amendment to the Constitution, where we would allow each State to decide what desecration is and the penalty therefor. What kind of a Constitution would it be where free speech will be determined by each of the 50 States? In one State you get the death penalty for spitting on the flag and another you get a \$10 fine for burning one in public. What kind of result would that be? And it is controversial. You ask the ordinary man on the street in America, "do you favor flag burning?" "Of course not. Who does?" "Do you favor prayer in school?" People are sure that they are going to get stricken dead if they say no.

You know why people vote for those things? Some of them vote for them honestly. They believe in it. And some of them simply do not want to go home and try to educate their electorate. You know being a legislator requires you to also be an educator.

And so here we are, on the Interior appropriations bill, giving away \$15.5 billion in gold and silver last night—corporate welfare galore—and cutting the NEA and NEH. Even with this amendment, those two programs are still cut 30 percent. So what does that mean? A little State like mine that has a fine symphony is going to have to get out and grub it out and try to find some money to make up for what they are going to lose from the National Endowment for the Arts. The Arkansas Repertory Theater, not big but extremely important to a few people, is going to have to go out and try to find the money or have a lot fewer performances. The very things that are so limited, but which make us a more civilized nation, are what we are choosing to cut.

Mr. President, most everybody who ever watched PBS knows who David McCullough is. He wrote that magnificent book on Harry Truman. And here is what he said about the NEH. Listen to this poignant quote.

When I think of what the National Endowment for the Humanities has done to support gifted young documentary filmmakers like

Ken Burns, when I count up the programs in "The American Experience" series that have benefited from Endowment funding—38 films thus far, including biographical portraits of such American figures as Eisenhower, FDR, Lindbergh, Duke Ellington, Thurgood Marshall—when I see the magnificent library of America volumes filling shelf after shelf, when I see in libraries and archives the priceless historic documents that have been preserved, all this, the films, the books, the conservation efforts—because of endowment grants, I know absolutely the value of the returns for such government investment.

Many years ago I read in Time magazine where the University of Texas was offering a dynamite course on the differences in the philosophies of Virgil's "Aeneid" and Homer's "Ulysses," sort of a comparison really of authoritarian versus nonauthoritarian governments.

They had room for 224 teachers for a 9-week course at the University of Texas, and they had 4,400 teachers apply for those positions. What a dynamite subject for teachers to pass on to their students about the beginnings of our civilization and how we got to where we are now.

So I began to try to get money here for that, because that one was privately funded. We finally got the National Endowment for the Humanities up to the point that last summer, Mr. President, they had 3,250 teachers in those summer seminar courses in philosophy, political science, our beloved Constitution, literature, drama, and art, and they go back and they pass that off to 500,000 youngsters.

So many children, particularly those who grow up in small towns like I did, are lucky to ever be exposed to anything that has any cultural enrichment. Turn the networks on tonight and turn on most of the pay-per-view movies, and you know what you get. I would hate to be raising children today. I feel sorry for parents in this environment. I think parents ought to have a right to determine what their children are going to see, and at the rate we are going, they are not going to see "Mister Rogers," Big Bird, and "Sesame Street." Oh, they must be subversive. Why else would we be cutting PBS funding?

I remember when I was a sophomore in high school and we were reading "Beowulf" we had a literature and English teacher, Miss Doll Means. She let us read a paragraph, and we would talk about that paragraph. I had been reading for a full page, and I looked up because I wondered why she was letting me read longer, and she said: "You have a nice voice and you read beautifully." She did more for my self-esteem in about 3 seconds than anybody, except my father, before or since. It was her saying that to me, plus the fact that I had had some success as a trial lawyer, to jump up out of a town of 1,000 people and run for Governor.

My father said public service is the noblest of all callings. I do not know what he would think today. I always thought I wanted my children to follow me in politics. I am not so sure. It was

always a given that we would go into public service, and now with the atmosphere, poisoned as it is all across America, people becoming increasingly uncivilized—"thank you" and "please" and "excuse me" are words you hardly ever hear anymore.

Mr. President, when I went to World War II, I was stuck overseas at the end of the war. One day, I saw a note on the bulletin board: "If you're interested in Shakespeare, show up at such and such a barracks tonight." I thought, I do not know anything about Shakespeare, but it beats sitting around the barracks. So I went. Six marines were there, and the teacher who was going to teach us about Shakespeare, as it turned out, not only was a Shakespearean scholar, but he was a Harvard professor. He had a tape recorder, which at that time was unheard of. I had never seen a tape recorder in my life. You could actually speak into a microphone and listen to your voice come back to you.

So he said, "We'll start off with Hamlet's speech to the players," and he did. He had a booming base voice. He said:

Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue; but if you mouth it, as many of your players do, I had as lief the towncrier spoke my lines.

That was pretty common. That has been 50 years ago, and I still remember it. He played it back on the tape recorder, and it sounded so beautiful. He said, "OK, you're first." And so I did it, and when he played it back to me, I could not believe I had an Arkansas twang. It was embarrassing to have to listen to it after Miss Doll Means told me I had a wonderful voice.

But do you know what? That day, listening to that tape recorder, I made up my mind I was not going to be like everybody else. I was going to learn to speak. I knew English because Miss Doll Means taught me how to diagram sentences and I knew how to speak because it was genetic; my father was a great speaker.

I said, "I'm not going to be like everybody else and just drift through life. I am going to try to be distinct."

These are personal stories, but they relate to the subject we are debating today. Think of the 500,000 children that are exposed to these teachers who go to these NEH summer seminars. Think of the people who watched "The Civil War" series on PBS. Think of the moral stories that children get from "Mister Rogers" and "Sesame Street", and look at the way people dress and the way they act, and you wonder where this country is headed. You read "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" and see if you see any analogies between then and now. Ask yourself why we spend less money on cultural enrichment than any other developed country in the world. I went to the Soviet Union in 1971. I was staggered by how much money that poor country spent on cultural programs, even trying to preserve the history of the czars.

Well Mr. President, while my speech may have been too lengthy, I just want everyone to know that I think the reduction in spending on NEA and NEH is a terrible tragedy. I applaud the Senators from Vermont for trying to do something about it.

I offered an amendment during subcommittee consideration of the Interior appropriations bill to increase funding for the NEH by \$15 million, and we succeeded. I am as proud of that as anything I have done since I have been in the Senate. But it pales in comparison to what we should be doing.

Someday—and it may be too late—we are going to understand that funding for NEA and NEH is not wasted money. It is money that makes us a greater Nation. It makes us more civilized. It makes us appreciate where we came from. It is a tragedy that we have to cut it. But I am very pleased to support the amendment to increase the levels of funding in comparison to the House bill.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. ASHCROFT assumed the chair.)

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I would like to make a couple of comments regarding the pending amendment. I appreciate what Senator SIMPSON stated when he gave quite a list as to how the National Endowment for the Arts has helped rural States such as Wyoming. Certainly, I can show an equal list of what it has done for the State of Idaho. Senator HUTCHISON, who went into great deal of her own experience and how this has helped. I am receptive to those arguments.

I know that we all realize there have been problems with the NEA with things that have been funded that I think no one in this Chamber is proud of. In fact, I remember last year there were examples of items that had been the product of perhaps grants from the National Endowment for the Arts that were in the Cloakroom that could not be brought out here because they were obscene. I do not think anybody can understand how we would utilize funds for that purpose.

But that was under a different situation. There is a new director now at NEA, Jane Alexander. I think many of us who have been watching have been favorably impressed by her and by those that she has surrounded herself with in working on this.

I say to those individuals that have this responsibility now, that as they look to the future, if in doubt, do not. If there is any question, if there is a gray area as to whether or not that particular project should or should not be funded because it could borderline on something that we would not want to see, that is not a question of censorship; that is a question of sponsorship. That is their responsibility. They must exercise that responsibility, and they must say on different occasions, no. Because if they do not, the Senate and the House will say no to the funding of the NEA.

But this amendment that is before us now contains language of the Senator

from North Carolina dealing with this question of obscenity, pornography. I feel it sets the parameters, sets the guidelines.

But, again, we have a situation where we have new leadership in the National Endowment for the Arts, and I am supportive of that leadership. I say let them continue this effort now under the new regime.

When I was mayor of Boise, ID, I know there were different occasions that, by use of public funds, not many but some, it serves as a catalyst so that you can increase efforts toward art and culture, because that defines a society. That is positive.

So I do support this amendment that is before us. I do support the efforts of Jane Alexander and those individuals that are working with her, but to remind them that they are going to have to make the tough decisions because, if not, we certainly will.

Mr. CRAIG. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I yield to the senior Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague. I want to associate myself with his remarks. I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for working out what could have been a very difficult situation and for recognizing, as I think the Senate always has, that there are public moneys for the arts, and there should be.

But what my colleague from Idaho just said, we have also recognized that there is a clear difference between censorship and sponsorship and the use of public dollars. Certainly the use of public dollars ought to meet the broad test. And the broad test is, can the general public view these experiences or can they view these acquisitions or these sponsorships? I think when you are using public dollars, you have to say yes.

While I appreciate some artists' expressions that others do not, I think it is important to recognize that we have the responsibility as the guardians of the public treasury and trust, that all that we do meets the broader test. Where there is an expressive individual who chooses to go in another direction, they ought to seek private sponsorship and not public sponsorship for such an expression.

I agree with my colleague from Idaho, that while our funds are limited and while this amendment represents a substantial cut, it also says very clearly that the Senate, the Congress, wants to continue the National Endowment and all that it does for our communities, and especially for rural States as has been so eloquently expressed by some, where small communities have little to no access to what larger communities have and the National Endowment has brought them the arts in very unique and positive ways. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. To conclude, I thank the managers of the bill because I think they have been very helpful in bringing us to the point where we can move forward in the proper fashion.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today as a cosponsor of the Leahy-Jeffords amendment to restore funding to the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute for Museum Services. I believe it is important to note at the outset that this amendment will not fully restore funding for any of these agencies. Indeed, these agencies are still will face cuts approximately twice that of overall spending in the Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I would like to share with the Senate just a few of the worthy programs in New Mexico that received funding in fiscal year 1995 from these agencies. This funding includes \$6,100 that the Museum of New Mexico received from the NEA for a traveling exhibit exploring the 20th century phenomenon of Hispanic women as *santeras*, or makers of saint icons, called "The Art of the *Santera*." The making of *santos* is a particularly beautiful and respected art form in New Mexico, and this exhibit traveled throughout the Southwest. The museum also received NEA funding for a family photography project, which served over 24,000 New Mexicans in Raton, Aztec, Jemez, Fort Selden, Clovis, and Las Cruces. Participants in these mostly rural communities learned how to preserve old family photos, and used the photos to improve their understanding of their history and culture.

The Museum of Indian Arts and Culture benefited from several NEA grants this year, including \$34,000 for the "Families and Communities" demonstration and mentoring program. With this funding, the museum will be able to establish eight teams of established and younger Indian artists to conceive, create, and demonstrate their traditional arts. Visitors to the museum will be able to discuss and interact with the teams as they work.

Mr. President, both of these award highlight the role the NEA has played and should continue to play in creating and disseminating culture, and facilitating communication and appreciation among the diverse communities living in New Mexico and throughout the Nation. In an increasingly balkanized society, we have more than enough issues that drive us apart. Art is a powerful tool we can use in our attempts to create ties that bind us back together.

The NEA is also an important tool in educating our children. We know that many important skills can be taught to children using the arts. Yet in my State, and throughout the Nation, schools are struggling to find funding for art education. I believe that the NEA can help leverage funding for this important activity. The city of Santa Fe, for example, recently applied for a grant of up to \$175,000 for arts education. I am told that this application was instrumental to the city council's

quick approval of a commitment to match that funding. It is likely that if the city is successful in establishing this program with seed money from the NEA, it will find a way to continue the program, perhaps with the help of private funding. I believe the experience of the city of Santa Fe is a perfect example of how the NEA has been able, with limited funding, to seed the development of enduring and very beneficial programs.

The final NEA grant in New Mexico I would briefly like to highlight was given to the Fund for Folk Culture, a national organization headquartered in Santa Fe. The Fund for Folk Culture has been able, with a \$50,000 grant from the NEA, to hire a staff person to administer \$750,000 in privately donated funds for grants to support folk art throughout the Nation. The NEA funding is needed because of the difficulty the Fund for Folk Culture faces in raising any private foundation money for salaries and administration. Mr. President, this grant is leveraging 15 times the amount of the NEA grant. I challenge my colleagues to point to other Federal programs with this sort of leveraging effect.

The NEH and IMS also fund outstanding projects in New Mexico. One that I have found particularly interesting is a grant the University of New Mexico has received from the NEH to find, catalog, and microfilm 2,600 historic newspapers. I am told by the managers of this project that many of the newspapers they are saving through this project are literally coming out of the attics of New Mexicans who had previously had no understanding of the historic resources lurking there. So far, 300,000 pages have been microfilmed as part of this effort, which is part of a nationwide historic preservation project. When complete, the project will be an invaluable resource for both historians and residents of many of the small, rural communities in New Mexico and throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I could continue for some time on the benefits brought to my State and the Nation by the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute for Museum Services. I believe that the examples I have given, however, highlight the central point I wish to make: Far from funding frivolous culture for the elite with public money, the NEA, NEH, and IMS are leveraging funding for educating our children, leveraging large amounts of private funding, and providing access to the arts and humanities for rural and disadvantaged American. This support is, in my opinion, critical to our sense of nation, and our ability to bridge the cultural differences that so often tear us apart rather than bring us together.

For all of these reasons, I am proud to cosponsor the amendment of my colleagues from Vermont.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we would be hard-pressed to find anyone in this Chamber to argue that art does not enrich American life. I think it would be equally difficult to find someone who has not been touched by art in some way at some important point in their lives.

There is no dispute that art has played an invaluable role in the cultural life of our Nation. Increasingly, however, we are presented with what amounts to a "yes or no" proposition: is art important enough to fund at the Federal level?

I firmly believe the answer to that question is "yes." Americans want the Federal Government to play a role in promoting the arts. And they feel so strongly about this issue precisely because the small amount of Federal funding received by the NEA each year goes so far toward enhancing the cultural life of our Nation.

The matching power of NEA grants is exceptional. Every dollar we appropriate at the Federal level generates more than \$12 at the State and local level. This extraordinary leveraging power has helped increase the number of arts organizations and opportunities around the country since the NEA's inception since 1965: the number of large symphony orchestras has doubled; the number of dance companies has increased from 37 to over 400; the number of theaters has multiplied by 8; and the number of State arts agencies has increased from 5 to 50.

I am not shy about admitting that a good deal of my support of the NEA derives from the benefits it provides my State. South Dakota is a rural State, and many communities could not maintain on their own the kinds of cultural opportunities they have been able to maintain with the help of the NEA and the South Dakota Arts Council, which also receives funding from the NEA.

My hometown of Aberdeen, SD, a city of about 25,000 people, has an orchestra and a community theater, both of which are made possible in part because of NEA dollars. And my hometown is one of the biggest cities in South Dakota.

The support provided by the NEA is even more important to the many smaller communities of my State: communities like Freeman, which has a Swiss choral society; Sisseton, which operates a Heritage Museum; and Faith, which has an arts and historical society—all of which operate with assistance from the NEA.

This is a big return for a relatively small investment.

Mr. President, I am aware of the budgetary constraints under which we operate this year. Each year our fiscal decisions get more difficult as the demands of a runaway deficit grow ever larger. In such an environment, we must look critically at every program, and the arts are no exception.

But let us be fair, and let us be reasonable. When I am told that it costs

each American only 64 cents per year to support the NEA, I have to admit that sounds like a good return on our investment. I do not believe the NEA deserves the level of funding cut it is facing. I do not believe Americans want this small investment—whose corresponding benefits are so great—taken away from them.

Unfortunately, the NEA has been an easy political target because of a few controversial grants it has approved. I fully appreciate the intensity of public opposition to Federal support for specific projects that many Americans consider offensive, and it is appropriate that the public and their representatives in Congress press this issue forcefully.

Concern about the NEA's grant application process has been expressed, and NEA Chair Jane Alexander has addressed that concern frankly and forthrightly. Moreover, I fully expect that dialogue between the Congress and Ms. Alexander to continue.

Nonetheless, the statistics have been overwhelmingly clear on this issue: the number of controversial grants made by the NEA is exceedingly small when compared to the total number of NEA-funded projects.

I should also add that I think it is unrealistic to expect the NEA to be entirely free of controversy. It never will be, and we should not expect it to be. In her remarks to the Senate Labor Committee during her confirmation hearing, Jane Alexander said that—

* * * the very essence of art, after all, is to hold the mirror up to nature; the arts reflect the diversity and variety of human experience. We are, as Hamlet says, 'the abstracts and brief chroniclers of the time,' and, as such, the artist often taps into the very issues of society that are most sensitive.

And that is the way it should be. We should have constructive debate on how to improve the grant application process and the operation of the NEA. But the fact that there is occasional controversy should not be used as an excuse to abolish the agency or drastically reduce its funding.

Mr. President, I realize we must make significant cuts in the budget this year. The arts, like every other area, will have to carry its share of the burden in this effort. It is my hope, however, that this debate will be fair, enlightened, and reasoned. Americans deserve the NEA's positive contributions to our culture.

AMENDMENT NO. 2304, AS MODIFIED

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment. The modification is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 2304), as modified, is as follows:

On page 95, line 9 strike "\$82,259,000" and insert "\$88,765,000".

On page 96, line 6, strike "\$17,235,000" and insert "\$21,235,000".

On page 96, line 23, strike "\$96,494,000" and insert "\$94,000,000".

On page 97, line 6, strike "\$18,000,000" and insert "\$16,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, strike "\$242,159,000" and insert "\$240,159,000".

On page 67, line 11, strike "\$385,485,000" and insert "\$381,485,000".

At the appropriate place, add the following:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used to promote, disseminate, sponsor or produce materials or performances which denigrate the objects or beliefs of the adherents of a particular religion."

At the appropriate place, add the following:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available to the National Endowment for the Arts under this Act may be used to promote, disseminate, sponsor, or produce materials or performances that depict or describe, in a patently offensive way, sexual or excretory activities or organs."

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, this amendment, sponsored by myself and Senators LEAHY, SIMPSON, PELL, BUMPERS, KENNEDY, and DODD, restores funds to the National Endowment for the Arts. This amendment does restore modest funds to the agency, but still in making this effort, the endowments will still carry the burden of greatly reduced budgets.

As I rise today, I must say that I am somewhat disappointed that we are not restoring even more funds to these agencies. I am well aware that cuts are inevitable this year, but I do not believe that these agencies should be singled out for a disproportionate share of reductions. The proposed reduction of 40 percent to the NEA will devastate the Endowment. More importantly, this reduction will have an enormously negative impact on communities throughout the Nation, especially rural communities.

It is very necessary and appropriate for our Government to support these agencies that encourage learning and support scholarship, preserve paintings and writings for future generations, bring the beauty and magic of art to all Americans as well as preserve and nurture our cultural heritage. The small contributions we make to these agencies go a very long way in preserving our history and investing in our future. This mission has been at the heart of both Endowments since their creation. Federal support has been under attack and criticism from those who perceive the Endowments as nothing more than Federal support for the rich and cultural elite. But nothing could be further from the truth.

We can point to many examples of the very real ways in which all of our States as well as local communities benefit from Endowment or IMS supported projects. The Endowments and the IMS support projects that invigorate our downtowns. The Shelburne Museum in Vermont attracts visitors from across the State, around the country and from abroad to see the wonders of this renowned folklife center. The Endowments and the IMS enrich the learning experiences of young

people in small communities, through grants to programs such as the Music, Words, Opera in schools throughout the State of Delaware, or the Artist in Residence Program which brought the Quantum Brass Quartet to Big Sandy, TX. They support projects to protect our most venerable works and texts for all to appreciate and see. A grant to the Historical Society of Iowa will go to preserving Iowa newspapers and a grant to Johns Hopkins University will go toward preparing an edition of papers of President Eisenhower. The Endowments make available projects and programs which make learning our history accessible and engaging such as the Civil War series, the Baseball series and other series on FDR and on the American Revolution.

The agencies have proven effective in nurturing our cultural heritage, making the arts and humanities accessible to all the corners of the Nation, providing learning opportunities for young and old and generally encouraging a growth and flourishing of the arts and humanities in this country. We should not take for granted the importance of the work of these agencies, especially in the difficult times that face our Nation.

The benefit to Vermont from these agencies is immeasurable, and Vermont, while unique in so many ways has that in common with all the other States in the country—they are well served by the programs supported by the NEA, NEH, and IMS. The projects and programs that the NEA, NEH, and IMS support are important and consequential. We can look at specifics, and we must today understand the impact of the cuts we are considering today. These drastic cuts will jeopardize both the important work being done by States in supporting local projects which the strengthen and enhance the education of our young people and provide learning opportunities for those not in school.

One cannot minimize the impact that arts has on increasing the level of participation, the level of interest, the level of commitment of children in school. One cannot minimize the value of having exceptional, world acclaimed dance companies like Mark Morris Dance Group and the Trisha Brown Company visit and perform to people in small communities in Vermont, or being able to participate in a cultural festival which brings people in the community together like the one in Rutland, my hometown, funded in part by the NEA—all in Vermont, all thanks to the support of the NEA, NEH, and IMS, and all of which are of significant importance and value to the people of the State. I am not willing to jeopardize the availability of the Vermont Council on the Humanities and their Beginning with Mother Goose Program; the Ethan Allen Homestead Trust in Burlington, and the Brattleboro Museum and Art Center, in Brattleboro supported by the IMS; and the Flynn Theater, the Vermont Coun-

cil on the Arts in Montpelier and Crossroads Arts Council in Rutland supported by the NEA.

I would like to share an article with you that appeared in Smithsonian magazine which was given to me by the Executive Director of the Vermont Council on the Arts, Nicki Clarke. It is about the Wolcott Children's Ballet, which sprang up in 1980 thanks to the incredible commitment of people in this community. It has continued on a shoe string budget and continues to have an enormous impact on the lives of all who are part of it—the young dancers, volunteers, instructors, Vermonters from Wolcott, Hardwick, and other towns. This ballet school has enriched the community, and made so many lives more full. It has received some of its much needed support from the Vermont Council on the Arts. Projects such as this are far too important to underestimate or ignore.

So I ask for your support today of this modest effort to make sure these agencies can continue to do their good works.

I will yield to the floor manager soon for his comments. What we have done here, through an error, we took the money from the wrong accounts. Looking at all the figures, I did not notice that. I apologize to my colleagues for that error. I think we have now adjusted the amendment to take the money from where everybody thought it was coming from.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Smithsonian Magazine article to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Smithsonian, May 1995]

DEEP IN THE NORTH COUNTRY, THEY DANCE
THEIR HEARTS OUT

(By Richard and Joyce Wolkomir)

In an out-of-plumb town hall in Wolcott, in northern Vermont's lumbering country, a child is dancing. It is 9 at night. Under bare light bulbs hung from a tin ceiling, the 10-year-old pirouettes to Vivaldi's *Four Seasons*. "*Releve lent!*"

Kennet Oberly, director of the 50-dancer Wolcott Children's Ballet, watches with penetrating black eyes as the girl rises on the balls of her feet, practicing a solo sequence. When the troupe takes *The Four Seasons* on the back roads in a few weeks, 3,000 schoolchildren and hundreds of adults in Vermont's hardscrabble "Northeast Kingdom" will see classical ballet. Far from the spotlights, the cheering fans, the megastars and the glittering performances of the nation's premier companies—the American Ballet Theater, say, or the Joffrey—a troupe of children practices in obscurity, striving for perfection. Oberly wants every foot to arch exactly. Every finger must curl just so. "*Arabesque*," he says. The child elevates one leg behind her, toes pointed.

Oberly, bald on top, a mane of black hair spreading over his collar, demonstrates the steps, lithe as an otter. "Good, Jamie," he says. "Now, *posé en arrière*." A log truck rumbles by, shaking the building. The child falters. A gust spatters the windows with April sleet. Oberly stops the battered tape recorder. Turning toward two visitors, he

pivots from the diaphragm, as if he were still onstage in Stuttgart, Tallinn, Helsinki, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Paris, Milan, Boston, Los Angeles, San Francisco or New York. "We're getting there," he says. "Almost."

Director and ballerina stoop to the day's final task. They pull up strips of gray duct tape for sticking mats to the floors, which decades of work boots and galoshes have worn too slick for ballet slippers. The child pulls a parka over her pink leotard. Outside, wisps of mist rise from the still-frozen ground. "Repetition is the mother of learning," Oberly says, and switches off the lights.

Weeks later, on a Sunday morning in May, a local agitator for good causes, Nola Denslow, is explaining how a classical ballet troupe sprang up here. She is talking over pancakes and maple syrup in the Village Restaurant in Hardwick, five miles east of Wolcott. Many of the diners are wearing billed caps inscribed "Caterpillar" or "John Deere." Parked outside are pickups with rifles racked across the rear windows.

It began when Nola Denslow knocked—presumptuously—on a stranger's door. She had moved to Vermont with her seven children "hoping to re-create the romance of rural Mexico," where she had once lived. But she found "any chance to be involved in the arts was limited." So in 1980 she dragooned volunteers, raised funds and got Wolcott to transform its boarded-up railroad station into an arts center, offering courses in everything from music to pottery making.

But no dance. Then Denslow heard that a retired ballerina and her husband lived on a Wolcott farm. June Gorton had been an early member of the Balanchine Company and had assisted Jerome Robbins in choreographing *The King And I*. Denslow quickly was knocking at the Gortons' door, which was opened by a gray-haired woman with a dancer's regal posture.

Teaching dance would be a tremendous service, Denslow said. "Absolutely not!" June Gorton said. "I don't dance anymore." "I'm really sorry," Denslow said, merciless in a good cause. "A lot of kids in this town should have this opportunity." The next day, Denslow's telephone rang. "I'll do it," June Gorton said.

She taught virtually for free. Her husband, Robert, built sets. But eventually the arts center's federal funding evaporated. Wolcott had to decide: road salt or watercolors? The vote was 50 to 49 for road salt. "When people realized it was lost, a gasp went through the town meeting," says Denslow. The Gortons announced they would fund the Wolcott Children's Ballet themselves. Classes moved to the Wolcott Town Hall.

For many youngsters, the ballet had become indispensable. Girls who had never heard classical music in their lives discovered that, onstage, they could excel. "Once, they were rehearsing with the Vermont Symphony Orchestra, which had a formidable conductor at the time," recalls Denslow. One little dancer, normally a mouse, turned to the baton-waving maestro on the podium and commanded: "Increase the tempo, please!"

In 1991 a cerebral hemorrhage partially paralyzed June Gorton. From her wheelchair she continued to take an active interest in the ballet, but she could no longer teach. Finding another director with June's qualifications, who could work for almost nothing, would be impossible. But the children were addicted. And so Wolcott took a deep breath and decided to raise money to hire a director. A Utah dancer agreed to come, despite the tiny salary. The "studio" awaiting her had wavy floors; sets and costumes were all homemade. She stayed only a year. And

then—by a fluke—Kennet Oberly and his wife, Larissa Sintsova, a principal dancer with the Estonian National Ballet, arrived from Tallinn.

Oberly's father, a physicist, developed the lens coating on the camera Neil Armstrong used on the moon. His mother, a theater director, was a founding member of Washington, D.C.'s Arena Stage Theater.

"When I was 5, in 1962, a touring group of West Side Story came to Boston, where we lived, and it electrified me—the energy, the music," Oberly remembers. "But what really got me was the guys jumping around in sneakers, knife fighting, smoking and climbing chain link fences—I thought it would be neat to get up there and smoke and climb chain link fences." "Wait until you're 8," his mother told him. When the family moved to Pittsburgh Kennet told his mother: "Now I'm 8." He became the only boy in a ballet class of 30 girls. "This was not what I'd intended," he says.

Still, by age 12 he was so promising that he became a student at the Harkness Ballet in Manhattan. By age 14 he had joined Germany's Stuttgart Ballet. Oberly danced next with the Boston Ballet, the Houston Ballet, the European troupe of Maurice Béjart, returning to the Boston Repertory Ballet in 1978. Then, for eight years he worked in Des Moines with Ballet Iowa, rising from dancer to artistic director.

He was ballet master of the Finnish National Ballet when the Estonia Theater invited him to revive works by the 19th-century Danish choreographer August Bournonville. While working with the Estonian ballet, Oberly married ballerina Larissa Sintsova. He had taught at a ballet camp in Vermont, and they decided to take over a dance school in Burlington. But the deal fell through. When they heard that the Wolcott Children's Ballet needed a director, "I took the plunge," says Oberly.

His salary is about \$20,000. But raising even that much is formidable for the Children's Ballet. "We're having a cash crisis right now," Oberly says, shrugging, as he pets Masha the cat, in his still mostly unfurnished house on one of Hardwick's steep back streets. Sintsova teaches at the Children's Ballet for free. "You can't look at it as a business, and that's one reason I like being here," says Oberly. "We're not trying to become the next Ballet of New England—we are two professionals who settled here for our own personal reasons, and we're trying to bring dance to the Northeast Kingdom."

At 3 the next afternoon, he is back at the Wolcott Town Hall, unrolling the floor mats. Bronwyn Potter, pianist for the troupe, lays her pocketbook on the hall's worn upright piano. Oberly begins taping down the mats.

Six days a week he teaches the school's 48 students. He also choreographs and conducts rehearsals for the spring production. Last year the dancers performed *The Four Seasons* in remote town halls throughout the Northeast Kingdom and in northern New Hampshire.

Tickets cost only about \$5. In the isolated hill towns—Island Pond, Hardwick, Orleans—weathered men come in work boots, and women wear their best dresses. Sometimes, as the music wells and the costumed dancers spin and leap, children in the audience run into the aisles to perform impromptu solos. Every year, some join the Wolcott Children's Ballet themselves.

At 3:30 p.m. a class of such beginners arrives, four ponytails, one pageboy. They line up in front of Oberly, belt-high recruits gazing up at their giant drill sergeant. Oberly demonstrates the movements he wants them to practice. First position: heels together, toes totally turned out. Second position: "Move your heels a foot apart." Third posi-

tion . . . "Elbow in front of your ribs," Oberly says, eyeing his ragged line of 8-year-olds. While the girls slowly execute two demi-pliés, he straightens torsos and adjusts elbows. He dances with one girl so she can mirror his movements.

As the lush practice music fills the hall, the little girls frown in concentration. If they learn to make their pliés and jetés precisely and gracefully, they will join the troupe and go on the tour. "It's not so important, ladies, to lift your leg high, because you get distortion," Oberly says. "It's like chocolate—do you want quantity or quality? We want Belgian dark chocolate. And just a little of it." "No!"—rebellion in the ranks. "Hershey bars!" "A lot!" Oberly pretends to look crestfallen. An older group is now arriving, their knapsacks full of schoolbooks and leotards and slippers.

Among the newcomers is Jamie McCollough, one of the students Oberly considers talented enough for a ballet career. That is her ardent plan, "Finances are the hard part," Jamie's father, Mark, a carpenter, had explained earlier that day at the McCollough's old house in Wolcott, which he is slowly shoring up and renovating. Jamie's mother, Mollie, a waitress, said: "Sometimes on her way to bed she actually apologizes for her passion for ballet, even though she's in fourth grade and gets straight A's! And in the morning she comes down and dances to the refrigerator!"

While the adults talked in the kitchen, Jamie and her friend Cody Leary, who also plans a dance career, practiced steps in the living room, in full stage regalia. The McColloughs worry about funding Jamie's training as a dancer once she is too old for the Wolcott Children's Ballet. They worry about the troupe itself. "I'm surprised about the audiences because it's just about always full houses," said Mark. "But now we have to raise money." The fundraising crisis, Mollie says, is never-ending.

"It's hard," she observes, "to ask the same little businesses month after month for money. Everything's difficult." Mollie points to the kitchen's cinder-block chimney, festooned with pairs of defunct dancing slippers. "Slippers—once a month! And the stockings!" But they are enthusiasts. As Mollie puts it: "Can you believe it? Ballet—here!"

At the hillside home of 13-year-old Eliza Martin, another of the dancers, the troupe's finances are also a worry. Eliza's father, Tom, a cabinetmaker, builds props when the troupe needs them. Her mother, Linda, Wolcott's town clerk, also serves on the ballet's board of directors. She believes the ballet has become part of everyday life here. "I think it gives the kids more than dance because it requires them to commit themselves to something, and performing gives them self-esteem. It's so important for adolescents to have a chance to do something besides watch TV or hang around on the streets—that's why I wanted to be a board member."

At the Wolcott Town Hall, Eliza Martin, Jamie McCollough, Cody Leary and the rest of their group have taken the floor. Oberly is eyeing their feet.

"What happens when you stand on your heels?" he asks. "You fall down. The moral is, stand on the balls of your feet. Even when you play basketball. Or prizefight. Do you know who Muhammed Ali is? How could he dance like a butterfly if he didn't stand on the balls of his feet?" Oberly presents a balletic interpretation of Muhammed Ali, dancing like a butterfly. "Each step you take is like stepping on stones along a lake, and do you know why?" Oberly asks. "Because every move you make for an audience must be special."

Now the most advanced students are arriving, girls of 13 and 14. While they warm up at

the barre, the younger group disperses next door to the Wolcott Store and Gas Station for a supper break. In their gauzy skirts and tights, holding grinders and Fudgesicles and bottles of juice, they line up at the counter behind two burly men in flannel shirts smeared with chain-saw oil, buying cigarettes and six-packs. Then they hurry back to the town hall to await their turn to rehearse for the spring tour.

They practice late into the evening. "One of our problems here is that these children never see ballet," Oberly announces. "They have only me and Larissa and each other, so we're all going to Boston." That weekend, most of the troupe goes to the big city to see the Boston Ballet perform *Eugene Onegin*. They return starry-eyed. Jamie McCollough and Cody Leary declare they are even more determined to make their careers in ballet. First, however, they must master *The Four Seasons*. "It's a meditation on the seasons," Oberly explains to one class. "Life is seasons, too, and we have our own inner seasons."

But this is a dance with no story. He must find ways to help the dancers bring it to life. "Really slow, Kaili," he says. Kaili Goslant, a slender 10-year-old from Morrisville, whose mother is a police officer and whose father operates a ski lift, is kneeling for a sequence in the "spring" section. "Make believe you're following a spider along the ground," Oberly suddenly says. "Catch it!" Kaili follows—and grabs—the imaginary spider. And one more segment of *The Four Seasons* is alive.

A bearded man wearing blue jeans and a flannel shirt walks into the hall. He tells two visitors watching the rehearsal that he is John Hancock, father of Juliette Hancock, one of the *Four Seasons* dancers. He is a logger and the treasurer of the ballet's board of directors.

Luckily, he says, use of the Wolcott Town Hall costs just \$10 a day. "If we had to pay at the commercial rate, we couldn't do it." Tuition is a minuscule \$5 per class. But even these modest fees are waived for children whose parents cannot afford them. Donations trickle in from businesses and citizens. And the troupe applies hopefully for grants. The Vermont Historical Society, for instance, funded half the \$1,600 for floor mats. Summers, when the resort town of Stowe puts on pop concerts, Wolcott Children's Ballet volunteers drive over the mountain to run a concession stand.

A few afternoons later, Kennet Oberly is teaching his boys class, while one mother, Peggy Sprague, watches from the sidelines. Her daughter, Kate, has just finished her class, and now it's her son Zachary's turn. When red-haired Zachary, who is 11, decided to take ballet, his mother was flabbergasted. "I told Zach the other boys at school might make fun of him, but he said he didn't care. He said it teaches him good balance."

After the boys troop out, Larissa Sintsova takes over another class. Her family moved to Estonia from Ukraine when she was 6, and she graduated from the Tallinn Choreographic Institute, becoming a principal dancer with the Estonian National Ballet. She brings to the Wolcott Town Hall the Russian no-nonsense style of dance teaching. As the six dancers line up at the barre, she pats her midsection. "Stomach!" she says, and the dancers instantly flatten in front. Satisfied, Sintsova moves down the line to Jamie McCollough, who requires only a slight adjustment to the curve of her wrist. "Remember, Jamie—nice hands," she says. Sintsova demonstrates new steps. The dancers imitate her.

"Chest is nice, but back—like this," she says, arranging a girl's posture as if arranging flowers. She drops to her knees to study

moving feet. She shows Jamie McCollough and Cody Leary where to look. Even the eyes—every molecule of the body—must be part of the dance. "Everybody! Elbows are very nice!" she announces. "But hands and arms—not forming a round line!" She has them run through the routine again. "Ever so slow, Jamie," says Sintsova. "And make the nice hands!"

Later that evening, the company's directors meet at the Puffer United Methodist Church in Morrisville. The issue is the new budget. "I always say, if they can run a tunnel under the English Channel and connect Britain and France, we can run a ballet company," says Mark Demers, minister of the Morrisville church and also of the Methodist church in Wolcott. "But I just saw a cartoon where you come out of the tunnel on the French side, and there's a huge guillotine poised over the exit, which seems to sum up our situation."

"We never made money on *The Nutcracker* at Christmas before, so why is it budgeted to earn \$3,500 now?" asks Jack Benoze, a retired Manhattan marketing executive, scrutinizing the budget with a businessman's eye. "Well, I was encouraged by the attendance at Hardwick last year," responds treasurer Hancock. "I can guarantee the rent on the town hall will increase, because the cost of fuel has doubled," says board member Linda Martin.

Tuition fees come up. Are they too low, especially when low-income families aren't even charged? The troupe faces a \$1,700 shortfall. "We don't want to turn children away," says Mark Demers. "We've never turned anyone away who couldn't pay, but what about those who say they'll pay and don't?" asks Jack Benoze.

The board decides to require 25 percent up front. But that does not solve one embarrassing problem: the directors owe a grant writer \$1,000. "We have to prioritize," says John Hancock, sadly. He points out that he is already paying from his own pocket for routine expenses, like the much-used duct tape. Mark Demers volunteers to send the grant writer an apologetic letter, explaining the delay in payment.

The next afternoon, rehearsals for the spring production continue. Now the first performance is just days away. "Kennet, what's the story of *The Four Seasons*?" asks one small blonde girl. "It's about all the insects in the local swamp," Oberly says blandly.

He lines up his "insects" for their next run-through. The sequence calls for one dancer to lie prone and beat out time on the floor with her hands, while another girl does a headstand and three more dancers form a rotating ring. Oberly gives more instruction in the art of walking, showing how to keep the chest up and the eyes on the goal. "You're going somewhere," he says. The dancers do it all again. Finally, Oberly nods.

One May 19th last year, the Wolcott Children's Ballet began its spring tour with five shows for schoolchildren, performed at Johnson State College. (This fall they will be presenting *The Little Match Girl*, using music composed by several girls in the troupe who live on a communal farm in East Hardwick, where they are home-schooled in music.) School buses from throughout northern Vermont rolled up to the auditorium each day, delivering 500 or so students per show.

For the first performance, the auditorium was filled with kids generating a DC-10 roar. One burly boy turned to the adults sitting behind him and announced with historic disgust: "We have to come every year." He pointed to his friend, who was even larger and rougher-looking: "He likes it!" The friend reddened.

Kennet Oberly walked onstage as the dancers cart-wheeled and pirouetted behind him.

He explained that the performance had no sets because it was abstract. "It's color, it's emotion, but there is no story line—it is pure movement, and it's about how we feel." The dancers were already moving across the stage, he said, because the seasons never start and never stop.

The dance began. And the 500 youngsters in the audience—amazingly—were attentively silent. At the end, raucous applause. Hoots. Whistles. As the audience left, several small girls danced out the door.

A few days later, the troupe began its next tour performance at the Hardwick Town Hall, where the stage floor is warped. It was, mostly, a bib overalls and billed-cap crowd. As the music filled the little hall and the dancers spun and leapt, seemingly in danger of tumbling off the tiny stage, toddlers in the audience took to the aisles to dance along. A tiny voice rose from somewhere in the hall: "I like the girls' costumes!"

Onstage, two little girls whistled like the November wind. Dancers whirled. Jamie McCollough danced her solo. *Relevé* lent, *arabesque*, *posé en arrière* . . . And she had—definitely—"the nice hands."

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senators from Idaho, who have spoken, and the Senator from Texas, both Senators from Vermont, and the Senator from Arkansas, and the Senator from Massachusetts, for the way in which we have been able to accommodate what I think is the justified expectations of people who sometimes rather strongly disagree. In any event, they formed a powerful combine, and together, with the cooperation from the Senator from North Carolina, who is deeply concerned about matters relating to obscenity and disrespect for religion, we have come upon and agreed upon an amendment in this field. I wish to make public the private assurances that I gave to the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, that this is not a pro forma amendment that I have agreed to, and I will defend the position of the Senate in any conference vigorously.

With that, I hope and trust that we are ready to accept the amendment by a voice vote.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I want to say one word. I thank certainly my colleague who I have known for many, many years, for all his assistance in bringing about what I believe we have as a consensus on passing this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2304, as modified.

The amendment (No. 2304) as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2303

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, what amendment do we return now to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the CRAIG amendment No. 2303.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator

BURNS be added as a cosponsor to the amendment of Senator CRAIG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, having spoken earlier to determine whether or not there were any objections or anyone else to speak, we have no speakers, and I believe we are ready to put the question.

NATURAL RESOURCES SCIENCE AGENCY'S [NRSA] GREAT LAKES SCIENCE CENTER IN ANN ARBOR, MI

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies in a brief discussion regarding the impact of H.R. 1977 on the Natural Resources Science Agency's [NRSA] Great Lakes Science Center in Ann Arbor, MI.

The committee's report accompanying the bill recommends approximately \$145 million for the NRSA, about \$28 million below the budget request. If the committee's recommended level prevails, will this center remain open in fiscal year 1996?

Mr. GORTON. It is the committee's intent to provide sufficient funds for research so that research units such as the Great Lakes Science Center and other aquatic fishery research centers can continue to operate in fiscal year 1996 to the extent possible.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Senator from Washington for his responsiveness. As he may know, the Great Lakes Science Center conducts fishery stock assessments that are relied upon by States, tribes, and Canada, in part to help fulfill treaty obligations. Effective management of fish stocks in the Great Lakes is critical to the \$4 billion fishing industry in the region.

The center has other important duties. Besides its fishery stock management activities, the center conducts invaluable scientific research on preventing, controlling, and mitigating the impacts of nonindigenous species, such as the zebra mussel. And, the center is conducting essential studies on the sources and health effects of toxics in the Great Lakes ecosystem.

I have been a supporter of the NRSA in the past. However, I am very concerned about administration proposals for allocating any possible fiscal year 1996 budget reductions disproportionately to the Great Lakes region. I will strongly oppose efforts to close or significantly reduce the center's activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the CRAIG amendment? The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2303) was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I believe we now have a full list of amendments to be proposed by Members on this side of the aisle, and I believe the other side of the aisle is very close to that point. I urge anyone who wishes to add his or her name to do so. I hope that soon we can at least get the unanimous consent agreement on what amendments remain to be discussed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2305

(Purpose: To permit the use of funds for the award of grants to individuals for National Heritage Fellowships and American Jazz Masters Fellowships)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], for himself, Mr. PELL, and Mr. SIMON, proposes an amendment numbered 2305.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 135, line 25, insert before the period at the end thereof the following: "National Heritage Fellowship, or American Jazz Masters Fellowship".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be set aside.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will not belabor the issue but I would like to explain this. I have the cosponsorship of Senator PELL and also Senator SIMON for the amendment.

Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1977 that would expand the category of individual fellowships that could be awarded by the National Endowment for the Arts to include National Heritage Fellowship Awards and American Jazz Masters Awards. Under the bill reported by committee, only literature individual grants could be awarded. This amendment provides no new funding—the NEA would have to pay for these honorific fellowships out of existing funds.

Mr. President, the fellowships I am seeking to restore, out of existing funding for the NEA in the bill, are given in recognition of outstanding achievement in the folk arts and in jazz music. An individual cannot apply for these awards; he or she must be nominated. To the best of my knowledge, these awards have generated absolutely no controversy at any time. They have, however, generated great and well-deserved pride for those receiving them, and have done much to preserve the folk and traditional art and jazz music that distinguish our great nation.

To give some flavor of the artists recognized by these awards, I can share with my colleagues some of the artists recognized by the National Heritage Fellowship Program this year. They include Mary Holiday Black, a Navajo basket weaver, Robert Lockwood, Jr., an African-American blues guitarist, Donny Golden, an Irish-American step dancer, and Buck Ramsey, a cowboy poet and singer from Amarillo, TX. Jazz artists recognized this year include Ray Brown, Roy Haynes, and Horace Silver. Each of these artists is

a part of our diverse and truly wonderful American cultural heritage, and all are worthy of our recognition. By recognizing these artists, we also gain the opportunity to appreciate our diversity, and the unifying effect this appreciation can have on our Nation.

I think it is worth noting that we are not the only nation that recognizes its masters of traditional art forms. In fact, the fellowships I seek to restore are sometimes called National Treasure Awards because they resemble the Living National Treasures awards given in Japan. I am told that those awards in Japan are in fact richer awards, providing annual stipends for life. Our awards, by contrast, provide one-time awards of \$10,000–\$20,000.

Although the financial award is often very important to the traditional artists and musicians receiving them, at least as important is the recognition that their art is cherished by our Nation. This national recognition simply cannot be recreated by the States, and for that reason, I believe that we must allow the NEA to continue these important programs.

In closing, I would like to quote one of the several New Mexicans who have received a National Heritage Fellowship. Upon receiving his award during the Reagan administration, the great Santos woodcarver George Lopez noted, "I receive this, but it is for all those who came before me and made a lesson for all of us with their lives."

Mr. President, let me just elaborate a little bit on each of these categories to make the point a little more clearly for my colleagues. The idea of these awards is to pick out a very few artists toward the end of their career, artists who provide a positive vision for what can be done and what can be preserved that is great in our culture and our heritage.

The recipients this year come from a variety of States—from New York, Utah, Missouri, Virginia, North Carolina, Alaska, California, Ohio, Florida, South Dakota, and Texas. All of these recipients are deserving recipients.

By giving them these National Heritage Fellowship Awards, we are acknowledging them for their work as teachers, their work as role models, mentors, or innovators. Each artist receives a one-time stipend, as I indicated.

Let me say a couple of words about the Jazz Masters Award. There have been many great jazz artists in the history of our country who have received this award in recent years: Dizzy Gillespie, Count Basie, Miles Davis, Ella Fitzgerald, Louis Bellson, Art Blakey, Sarah Vaughan, and Lionel Hampton are examples that I think all Members of this body will recognize.

The present practice of the National Endowment for the Arts is to make awards to somewhere between 3 and 5 individuals each year under the Jazz Masters Awards, to make awards to 12 individuals each year under the National Heritage Award.

As I said at the very beginning of my discussion, this is not an amendment to add money to the National Endowment for the Arts budget. All this amendment is, Mr. President, is a granting of authority for the National Endowment for the Arts to continue with these very valuable, very important programs which we have all recognized over the years.

I point out to my colleagues and remind them that each year, here in the Senate, we have a reception at which we recognize and acknowledge and congratulate the winners of these National Heritage Fellowship Awards. So I think it would be highly misguided for this body at this time to approve legislation that prohibits the National Endowment for the Arts from going forward and maintaining this tradition that they have begun, which I think is so important to our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a full list of the National Heritage Fellowship Award winners, by State.

There being no objection, the list was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HERITAGE FELLOWSHIP AWARDS BY STATE

ALABAMA

Dewey Williams, Shape Note Singer 1983
Jerry Brown, Potter
Nora Ezell, African American Quilter

ALASKA

Ester Littlefield, Alaskan Craftsman 1991
Belle Deacon, Basketmaker
Nichalos and Elena Charles, Woodcarvers
Paul Tiulana, Eskimo Artist
Jenny Thlunaut, Blanket Weaver

ARIZONA

Chesley Wilson, Fiddle Maker

ARKANSAS

Almeda Riddle, Ballad Singer 1983
Glenn Ohrlin, Cowboy Singer

CALIFORNIA

Brownie McGhee, Blues Guitarist 1882
John Lee Hooker, Blues Musician 1983
Natividad Cano, Mariachi 1990
George Blake, Native American Craftsman 1991

Edwardo Guerro, Mexican Composer 1991
Kahmvong Insixiangmai, Asian Singer 1991
Gussie Wells, African American Quilter
Arble Williams, African American Quilter
Francisco Aguabella, Afro Cuban Drummer
John Naka, Bonsai Sculpter
Louis Ortega, Raw-hide Worker
Kansuna Fujima, Dancer
Jose Guitierrez, Musician
Richard Hagopian, Musician

COLORADO

Eppie Archuleta, Weaver

CONNECTICUT

T. Viswanhhan, Flute Master
Ilias Kementzides, Musician

FLORIDA

Nikitias Tsimouris, Greek American Musician

GEORGIA

Bessie Jones, Georgia Sea Island Singer 1982
Hugh McGraw, Shape Note Singer 1982
Lanier Meaders, Potter 1983
Lucinda Toomer, Black Quilter 1983
McIntosh County Shouters, Spiritual Performers

Claude Joseph Johnson, Singer
HAWAII
Marie McDonald, Lei Maker 1990
Seisho Nakasone, Okinawan Musician 1991
Nalani Kanaka'ole and Pualani Kanaka'ole
Kanahele, Hula Masters
Emily Kau'i Zuttermeister, Hula Master
Meali'i Kalama, Quilter
Raymond Kane, Guitarist
Clyde Sproat, Hawaiian Cowboy Singer
IDAHO
Rose Frank, Native American Weaver 1991
Elmer Miller, Silversmith
Jimmy Jausoro, Accordionist
ILLINOIS
Adam Popovich, Tamburitza Musician 1982
Joe Shannon, Irish Piper 1983
Michael Flatley, Irish Step Dancer
Albert Luandrew, Blues Pianist
INDIANA
Earnest Bennett, Whittler
IOWA
Genevieve Mouglin, Lebanese-American
Lace Maker 1984
Everett Kapayou, Native American Singer
KANSAS
Sonia Domsch, Lacemaker
Kepka Belton, Egg Painter
KENTUCKY
Morgan Sexton, Banjo Player
Clyde Davenport, Fiddler
Lilly Mae Ledford, Musician
LOUISIANA
Dewey Balfa, Cajun Fiddler 1982
Ada Thomas, Chitimacha Basketweaver
1983
Clifton Chenier, Creole Accordionist 1984
Marc Savoy, Accordion Maker
Inez Catalon, Singer
Alfonse Ardoin, Accordionist
Canray Fontenot, Fiddler
Thomas Edison Ford, Cowboy Singer
Allison Montana, Costume Maker
MAINE
Slater Mildred Barker, Shaker Singer 1983
Simon St. Pierre, French American Fiddler 1983
MARYLAND
Lem Ward, Decoy Carver/Painter 1983
Peou Khatna, Dancer
Ola Belle Reed, Banjo Player
MASSACHUSETTS
Joseph Cormier, Cape Breton Violinist 1984
MICHIGAN
Wade Mainer, Banjo Picker
Yang Fang Nhu, Weaver
Howard Armstrong, String Band Musician
Art Moilanen, Accordionist
MINNESOTA
Leif Melgaard, Woodcarver
Maud Kagg, Ojibwe Storyteller
Christy Hengel, Concertina Maker
MISSISSIPPI
Othar Turner, Fife Player
Jack Owens, Blues Singer
MISSOURI
Henry Townsend, Blues Musician
Mone and Vanxay Saenphimmachak, Lao Weaver
Willie Mae Ford Smith, Gospel Singer
Mabel Murphy, Quilter
MONTANA
Walace McRae, Cowboy Poet
NEBRASKA
Albert Fahlbusch, Hammered Dulcimer
Maker/Player 1984
NEVADA
B.B. King, Bluesman
NEW HAMPSHIRE
Newton Washburn, Basket Maker

NEW JERSEY
Giuseppe and Raffaella DeFranco, Musicians
Charles Hankins, Boat Maker
Harry Shourds, Decoy Carver
NEW MEXICO
George Lopez, Santero 1982
Margaret Tafoya, Santa Clara Potter 1984
Cleofes Vigil, Storyteller/Singer
Helen Cordero, Pueblo Potter
Emilio and Senaida Romero, Hispanic-American Tin and Embroidery Workers
NEW YORK
Joe Heney, Irish Singer 1989
Sanders "Sonny" Terry, Blues Musician 1982
Mike Manteo, Sicilian Marionettist 1983
Elizabeth Cotten, Black Songster/Songwriter 1984
Martin Mulvihill, Irish-American Fiddler 1984
Howard "Snadman" Sims, Black Tap Dancer 1984
Dave Tarras, Clarinetist 1984
Periklis Halkias, Greek Clarinetist
Jack Coen, Irish Flautist
Fatima Kuinova, Jewish Singer
Ng Sheung-Chi, Chinese Folk Singer
Liang-Xing Tang, Lute Player
NORTH CAROLINA
Tommy Jarrell, Appalachian Fiddler 1982
Ray Hicks, Appalachian Storyteller 1983
Stanley Hicks, Appalachian Storyteller/Musician/Instrument Maker
Bertha Cook, Knotted Bedspread Maker 1984
Burlon Craig, Potter 1984
John Dee Holeman, African-American Dancer/Singer
Douglas Wallin, Ballad Singer
Etta Baker, Guitarist
Walker Calhoun, Cherokee Musician
Doc Watson, Appalachian Guitarist
NORTH DAKOTA
Sister Rosalia Haber, Lace Maker
OHIO
Elijah Pierce, Carver/Painter 1982
Kenny Sidle, Fiddler
OKLAHOMA
Georgeann Robinson, Osage Ribbonworker 1982
Joyce Doc Tate Nevaquaya, Indian Flutist
Vanessa Paukeigope Morgan, Kiowa Regalia Maker
OREGON
Duff Severe, Western Saddlemaker 1982
Bua Xou Mua, Hmong Musician
Genoveva Castellanoz, Corona Maker
PENNSYLVANIA
Horace "Spoons" Williams, Spoons Player
Em Bun, Silk Weaver
LaVaughn Robinson, Tap Dancer
PUERTO RICO
Rafael Cepeda, Bomba Musician/Dancer
Julio Negron-Rivera, Instrument Maker
Juan Alindato, Carnival Mask Maker
Emilio Rosado, Woodcarver
SOUTH CAROLINA
Philip Simmons, Ornamental Ironworker 1982
Janie Hunter, Black Singer/Storyteller 1984
Mary Jane Manigault, Black Seagrass Basket Maker 1984
SOUTH DAKOTA
Alice New Holy Blue Legs, Quill Artist
Kevin Locke, Lakota Flute Player
TENNESSEE
Bill Monroe, Bluegrass Singer 1982
Alex Stewart, Cooper/Woodworker 1983
Nimrod Workman, Ballad Singer

Robert Spicer, Flat Foot Dancer
Kenny Baker, Fiddler
The Fairfield Four, Gospel Singers
Earl Scruggs, Banjo Player
TEXAS
Lydia Mendoza, Mexican-American Singer 1982
Narcisco Martinez, Tejano Accordionist/Composer 1983
Valerio Longoria, Mexican-American Accordionist
Alex Moore, Sr., Blues Pianist
Pedro Ayala, Accordionist
VERMONT
Amber Densmore, Quilter
VIRGINIA
Ralph Stanley, Banjo Player
John Jackson, Black Songster
John Cephas, Blues Singer
WASHINGTON
Santiago Alameda, Tex-Mex Conjunto Musician
WEST VIRGINIA
Melvin Win, Fiddler
WISCONSIN
Louis Bashell, Polka Master
Gerald Hawpetoss, Menominee Reglia Maker
Ethel Kvalheim, Rosemaller
WYOMING
Don King, Saddle Maker

Mr. BINGAMAN. I am glad to respond to any questions anyone has about this, if there is any confusion about the purpose of my amendment. It is an amendment I know several Senators support. Perhaps some of them would like to speak. I know the Senator from Vermont had indicated he wanted to speak briefly in favor of the amendment.

Perhaps—in order to ensure that he has that opportunity, at least for a few moments here, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I listened to the Senator from New Mexico. I understand the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] has had concerns about this amendment and it is also for that reason a quorum was put in. We needed to check with her to see whether or not she wished to speak on the amendment.

I am now informed the Senator from Kansas will later put a statement in the RECORD on this, and is willing to allow the amendment to be voted on by voice vote.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I just informed the manager I was advised by Senator JEFFORDS he did want to speak briefly in favor. I do not know if that is still the case, but we are checking on that. If we can just have another few moments with which to do that, and then have a voice vote? I certainly do not require a rollcall vote on the issue. I would just like him to be able to make a statement if he desires to do so.

Mr. GORTON. I note the presence of the Senator from Vermont now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I have listened to the statement of my good friend from New Mexico on the amendment. I personally support it. I do not believe in any way it goes against what we intended to do in the committee, with respect to individual artists and the questionable works of some.

The purpose and intent of reducing those who are eligible for individual grants was to protect the integrity of what we are trying to do in preserving the endowment.

I personally believe that the amendment represents an improvement in the bill.

I have notified the chairman of the committee [Senator KASSEBAUM], who may or may not have an objection to it—notified her some time ago, Senator KASSEBAUM. I do not know her feelings. In committee she was very restrictive, and understandably so. But I support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont. Based on the statement that the manager of the bill has made about the Senator from Kansas intending to put a statement in the RECORD but allowing this to be voice voted, I have no objection to that procedure. If we could dispose of it at this time, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on amendment No. 2305, the Bingaman amendment?

If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2305) was agreed to.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GORTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we are open for business. There may be discussions going on at the present time. I can say I know the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] has an amendment on stewardship incentive programs which will require debate and a vote. I believe the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] has an amendment on the red wolf, which I suspect will require a vote.

I know Senator SIMON has an amendment on a museum that I believe will require a vote. And perhaps two or three others.

But I solicit Members to come to the floor and see whether or not we can accept their amendments or have a debate. The majority leader, understandably, would like very much to finish this bill by late this afternoon in order that we can go on to further business and begin our summer recess promptly.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I recognize that we have completed action on an amendment that was offered by Senator JEFFORDS relative to restoration of funds for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. However, I would like to make a brief statement on those issues.

Mr. President, I am pleased with the action we have taken today. I share the disappointment of my colleague from Arkansas, Senator BUMPERS, that it was not more substantial. And I hope that the action today is an indication of a continued interest by the Senate on the issue of national support for the arts and the humanities that we can build upon this decision in future years.

I believe that this issue of the appropriateness of a national commitment to support the arts and humanities has unfortunately been trivialized in that a few extreme examples have been cited as representative of the totality of our national effort and have in fact distorted what the United States has done in terms of its support for the arts and humanities.

Let me just mention a few things that benefit America in a very real and tangible sense which would not be but for this national commitment to the arts and the humanities. One of those is to bring the arts to the areas of America that would otherwise be excluded from such exposure because of their remoteness, because of their small population, because of their lack of a cultural infrastructure.

In my own State of Florida, many small communities are benefited by having access to performing arts and creative arts which they would not have but for the grants that are made available either directly through the national endowments or through the State endowment programs that depend upon Federal support.

One of the most important aspects of the National Endowment for the Humanities is the support for America's libraries. America's libraries are probably the most underappreciated aspect of our educational system. They provide resources increasingly in all of the means by which information and ideas and creativity are transmitted to all Americans. They are a free institution that contributes significantly to seeing that all Americans have an equal access to learning.

We debated this extensively during the course of the telecommunications bill and decided that it was appropriate to give some special recognition to

public libraries in terms of their access to the information highway. The National Endowment for the Humanities has been providing that on ramp for many years through its support of the expansion of opportunities available through public libraries.

The preservation of historic documents is largely a responsibility of the National Endowment for the Humanities through programs like the Brittle Book program, which is converting tens of thousands of books which would otherwise evaporate in a physical sense, evaporate but for the efforts supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities to see that they are microfilmed and preserved. Today one of the most important aspects of this preservation relates to newspapers. As many newspapers, particularly smaller newspapers, go out of existence or merge, their libraries of old newspapers are now being preserved through the efforts of the National Endowment for the Humanities, an invaluable resource of the history and culture of our Nation.

It is unfortunate that this debate on the national support for the humanities and arts is often characterized as elitist, that the only people who care about this issue are small groups of persons who are affluent enough to do this on their own and, therefore, inappropriate for public support.

I disagree with that and so would the facts. As an example, Mr. President, the Metropolitan Museum in New York, which most Americans have benefited from, even those who live thousands of miles away from New York City, that great world treasury draws more people annually than all of the sports teams in New York City. More people visit the Metropolitan Museum than visit the Giants, the Mets, the Yankees, the Knicks, and all of the other professional teams in New York City. It is not an elitist institution. It is an institution which serves the broadest public interest.

There are important economic aspects of our support for the arts. Strong artistic institutions create a synergy in terms of the economics of the communities. There are many examples in my State. I would just cite the tremendous economic influence which the Miami City Ballet, which has received support through these endowments, has had in terms of supporting important artistic and economic components of our State. But beyond the economics, there are extremely important cultural aspects of our support for the arts.

Throughout time, societies have influenced their world by the use of the arts. One of the reasons that the Greeks and the Romans, and the Egyptians before them, were such powerful influences and then have continued to influence our life today, is because of the arts and the use of the arts as a means of expressing a societal set of ideas and values which have had transcendence of importance.

Today, the United States of America, while we may have a trade deficit in terms of the sale of products, has an enormous trade surplus in terms of the export of ideas and creativity. That not only has economic value, but it also helps to advance the cultural goals that the United States hopes to carry to the world. We want the world to see the values that we stand for—freedom, independence, respect for human rights, democracy, a market system that democratizes economic decisions. We would like to see the world adopt those values, not because we want to impose them but because we think those are the values that advance the human spirit. Our investment in and our dominant position in the culture of the world is an important means by which we will achieve that goal.

The support for the small artistic institutions or the individual artists is the seed corn for our ability to exercise that type of a strong cultural influence in the world.

One of my favorite political figures, Mr. President, was the President of Costa Rica during the 1940's and 1950's, President Figueres, whose son is now the President of Costa Rica. President Figueres did a number of bold acts as President of Costa Rica. He disbanded the army. He took the money that had been spent on the military and used it to enhance education and health and the arts, including the establishment of a national symphony for the small and relatively poor country of Costa Rica.

President Figueres was much criticized for the establishment of a national symphony. It was too much for the economy of Costa Rica to be able to support. It was a diversion of funds away from more important and immediate needs of the people. President Figueres responded to those criticisms by saying, "We in Costa Rica believe in work. We work hard on tractors. Why do we work hard on tractors if it is not to be able to listen to violins?"

The arts express the reason for life. Tractors are important, but they are a means by which we can enrich our spirit by exposure to the arts.

So, Mr. President, we have made a small step forward today in recognizing the importance of that in our times and in our society, the United States of America.

It is not as far as I would have wished that it could have been but by preserving this base of national support for the humanities and the arts, I hope that we will be planting our own form of seed corn that will allow us to grow a deeper and more abundant support for these important national initiatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the American Historian David McCullough in support of the Endowments for the Humanities and Arts.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF DAVID MCCULLOUGH BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 16, 1995

As a citizen I am greatly concerned about the decline of library facilities in our schools, the decline, even the elimination of art, music, and dramatic instruction in the schools, the reduction of services at our public libraries, and the current ill-reasoned, ill-informed assaults on public television. But as one who works in public television. But as one who works in public television and with schools and universities, museums, libraries, I also know the marvelous possibilities there are, how much more can be done and done better, and that to me is what is so exciting.

In the year 1814, after invading British troops burned the congressional library, and Thomas Jefferson offered to sell Congress his own library as a replacement, a heated debate ensued. The issue, much like today, divided mainly on party lines, with those in opposition to the purchase arguing that the cost was too much or that since the books belonged to Mr. Jefferson, a known free-thinker, some might not be at all suitable. Critics attacked the very idea of wasting federal money on "philosophical nonsense." A large number of the books were described by one member of Congress as "worthless, in languages which many can not read, and most ought not."

But Congress voted for the purchase, \$23,950 for 6,500 volumes. It may be seen as the beginning of federal involvement in the arts and humanities and to the everlasting benefit of the country. Today the Library of Congress is the largest, finest repository of knowledge in the world, a crown jewel in our national life.

The Lincoln Memorial, completed in 1922, is a great work of public art. Its colossal statue of Lincoln, an effort of thirteen years by the American sculptor Daniel Chester French, is indeed the greatest work of public sculpture in America and stunning testimony to the virtue of public support—public money—for the area. It was costly to create. It is costly, still—more than a million dollars a year for upkeep and guide personnel—and worth every Lincoln penny of that.

In the 1930s, during the hard times of the Great Depression, came the Federal Writers Project, the Federal Arts Projects, the Federal Theater Project, providing work opportunities for writers and artists as never before. The Federal Writers Project alone employed 12,000 people, among whom were young Richard Wright, Ralph Ellison, Eudora Welty, and Saul Bellow. The paintings, post office murals, the incomparable series of state guidebooks that resulted are among our national treasures.

In World War II, hundreds of artists, photographers, filmmakers were assigned to record the experiences of American service men and women on both fronts, and again at government expense.

The programs and projects of the National Endowment for the Humanities "are sound investments for the federal government to make, even during this era of fiscal constraints," said the chairman of the Endowment, Lynne Cheney, before a House committee in 1991. The American people, she said the following year, "value the humanities and understand the importance of things historical and cultural." Projects supported by the Endowment, she continued, "help to make available a rich variety of opportunities for people to learn more about the nation's heritage and the history and thought of other cultures." What she said was right then and it is right today, make no mistake.

It is argued that because a few of the hundreds of programs sponsored by the Endowment have proven unworthy, or ill-conceived, or worst of all, flagrantly offensive, that therefore both the National Endowment

for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities should be done away with. That's absurd. It would be like saying that because of the Tailhook Scandal we must get rid of the Navy.

When I think of what the National Endowment for the Humanities has done to support gifted young documentary film makers like Ken Burns, when I count up the programs in The American Experience series that have benefited from Endowment funding—thirty-eight films thus far, including biographical portraits of such American figures as Eisenhower, FDR, Lindbergh, Duke Ellington, Thurgood Marshall—when I see the magnificent Library of America volumes filling shelf after shelf, when I see in my own research in libraries and archives the priceless books and historic documents that have been preserved, all this, the films, the books, the conservation efforts—because of Endowment grants, I know absolutely the lasting value of government support.

Last night's broadcast of The American Experience, a program called "One Woman. One Vote," marking the 75th anniversary of the 19th Amendment, was called "first rate" by The Wall Street Journal, which also praised the "intellectual mettle and moral character" of the protagonists portrayed in the long fight for women's suffrage. The broadcast, funded in part by the National Endowment for the Humanities, was seen by about 5,000,000 people. And that's only the beginning. As the executive producer of the series, Judy Crichton, says, this is not "disposal television." Every program is rerun, and with the audiences for the second or third broadcasts often larger than the first. Further, the programs are used in schools throughout the country, and more so all the time.

Anyone who claims that commercial television could do the same thing as well doesn't know what he's talking about.

The Library of America has been called by Newsweek, "the most important book publishing project in the nation's history." It is a collection of the riches of our American literature and political philosophy, cloth-bound, on acid-free paper, and reasonably priced. There are now seventy-three titles in print, two and a half million of these books in circulation. Were it not for the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Library of America would not exist.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell you about the rare documents in the collection of the library of the Philadelphia Athenaeum, including original architectural drawings of the Capitol, that are being properly maintained with the help of NEH grants. I can tell you about the twenty-year program, starting in 1989, with congressional support, the goal being to preserve on microfilm the content of some 3,000,000 brittle books. Grants already made will, when completed, have saved the contents of 660,000 volumes. This is unprecedented. And seventy libraries are taking part nationwide. I can tell you about the humanities program at one of our oldest and best small colleges, Union College in Schenectady, New York, which next week celebrates its 200th birthday. Long known for the strengths of its science and technology departments, Union, motivated by two NEH grants, is greatly enlarging its library and thus its whole humanities curriculum. Because of three NEH grants for the new John Heinz Pittsburgh Regional History Center, grants totaling \$1,500,000, we have been able to raise at least twice, if not three times that amount, from private, corporate, and foundation sources. Critics of the Endowment's carp about money spent for elitists' interests. Mr. Chairman, attendance for this

one new museum is expected to be somewhere between 400,000 and 500,000 people a year, including at least 100,000 school children. And while the NEH grants represent only a fraction of the total cost, perhaps 6 percent, I assure you the project would not be where it is today had there been no National Endowment endorsement.

One of the glories of our American way of life, Mr. Chairman, is our nation-wide system of public libraries, free public libraries, the large majority of which, let me emphasize, are located in small towns and cities of less than 25,000 people.

When you cross the threshold into an American public library, you enter a world of absolute equality. All are welcome, all have the same access to the riches within.

We hear much talk about the information highway. But information isn't learning, isn't education, and there is no education without books. In our wonderful public libraries the books are free. Everyone has open access to ideas. The computer hookups, too, are free. At the public library, a youngster in a town on the Nebraska plains or a mill town in Ohio can tie in to the same resources now as a student at one of the great universities. Isn't that marvelous? Isn't that American?

Newspapers, magazines, books in bookstores, cable television, they all cost money. They're all fine if you can afford them. Our national parks now charge an admission. There's even talk here of charging for a tour of the Capitol! But the public libraries remain free to the people, thank God, and I don't know of federal dollars better spent than those that through the National Endowments go to support our public libraries.

Mr. Chairman, we now have 6,000,000 children living below the poverty level—in this country, here in the United States of America. What an outrage that is. And what a terrible cost it will mean, unless something is done. What kind of education will those children get? What kind of education will any of our children get if the cutbacks continue in the teaching of arts and music in our public school? What can we expect when school libraries have no books, or when school libraries are shut down.

Mr. Chairman, as good as the work of the National Endowments has been it is hardly a scratch on what could be done, and what needs to be done. We have, for example, the two great existing national institutions of public television and the public library system that could join forces. They're going concerns, each with its own immense power. Join that power, those resources, and the effect could mean new breakthroughs in education at all levels. I feel very strongly about this. I want to see television audiences brought in to the libraries and the libraries brought home to television audiences, and I am working on a new project to that end.

Instead of arguing over cutting the life out of the existing programs of the Endowments, or ditching them altogether, we ought to be joining forces in an effort to make them better, more effective, of even greater benefit to the country. We ought to be using our imaginations to do more not less. Appropriations for the Endowments shouldn't be cut, they should be doubled.

Mr. Chairman, more than two hundred years ago, a member of another congress, the Continental Congress, wrote privately of his fear that the future might be in the hands of members who would hold sway by "noise not sense, by meanness not greatness, by ignorance nor learning, by contracted hearts not large souls."

As events would prove and to the everlasting benefit of our nation, he, John Adams, and others of the founders were Americans of abundant sense, learning, and soul, who

knew education to be the foundation upon which depended the whole daring American experiment.

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be," warned Thomas Jefferson. If was the example of America that so mattered for the future of mankind.

They were politicians, to be sure. They could be inconsistent, contradictory, mistaken, human. But they were great lovers of books, of language, of art, of history. They were architects, musicians, philosophers, and poets, if not in practice, then certainly at heart.

John Adams, let us also not forget, was a farmer who worked his land with his own hands, whose homestead comprised all of four rooms.

In your deliberations, Mr. Chairman, you and your fellow members of Congress—you who have so much of the future of the country in your hands—might well take to heart these wonderful lines written by John Adams in a letter to his wife Abigail.

"I must study politics and war that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy. My sons ought to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history, naval architecture, navigation, commerce, and agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry, and porcelain."

Mr. Chairman, a great nation puts the highest value on its art and literature, its history, its intellectual heritage. A great nation takes its measure by the quality of life on its citizens. A great nation takes care of its children, provides schools second to none, schools where painting and music are never dismissed as frills, never ever considered expendable. A great nation prizes its poets no less than the best of its politicians.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. PRYOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, with the permission and understanding of the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], and also after consultation with the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for a time not to exceed 12 minutes in morning business.

Mr. GORTON. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, the Senator from Arkansas has been waiting a long time to make remarks and I certainly want to allow him to make the remarks. We do have now present in the Chamber the Senator from Illinois, who will have an amendment which will require a rollcall vote. So as promptly as the Senator from Arkansas completes his remarks, I hope we will go to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, then let me withdraw that request.

Mr. SIMON. Go ahead.

Mr. PRYOR. The Senator from Illinois says he is waiting, so I will proceed.

COLLECTION ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, on Saturday when the Treasury, Postal Service

and general Government appropriations bill came to the floor of the Senate, it had what I thought to be a rather odd provision. I authored and had introduced in my behalf—I was not present on Saturday—an amendment to strike \$13 million to "initiate a program to utilize private counsel law firms and debt collection agencies in the collection activities of the Internal Revenue Service."

In short, Mr. President, this provision requires the IRS to spend \$13 million—this was under the proposed language—to hire private law firms and private bill collectors to collect the debts of the American taxpayer owed to the Internal Revenue Service. My amendment is very simple. It strikes this provision from the Treasury, Postal Service appropriations bill, as well it should. I thank the managers of the bill for accepting my amendment. I urge the conferees to stay with the decision of the Senate in this matter.

Mr. President, in over 200 years of our Federal Government, we have never turned over the business of collecting taxes to the private sector.

I must point out that this dubious practice is as old as the hills and dates back to ancient Greece. The practice of a private tax collection theory even has a name, I have discovered. It is called tax farming. Its modern history is chronicled in a book authored by Charles Adams, a tax lawyer and history teacher. This book is named, "For Good and Evil: The Impact of Taxes on the Course of Civilization."

In this book, Mr. Adams recounts many tales of how the world has suffered under the oppression of tax farmers. He specifically describes the tax farmers sent by the Greek kings to the island of Cos as "thugs, and even the privacy of a person's home was not secure from them," according to the author. He further states that a respected lady of Cos around 200 B.C. wrote, "Every door trembles at the tax-farmers." Once again, Mr. President, the tax farmers were the private collectors of the public debt.

In the later Greek and Roman world, no social class was hated more than the tax farmer. A leading historian of that period described tax farmers with these words:

The publican (keepers of the public house) certainly were ruthless tax collectors, and dangerous and unscrupulous rivals in business. They were often dishonest and probably always cruel.

Tax farming flourished; it was a monster of oppression in Western civilization, in many forms, for over 2,500 years until its demise shortly after World War I.

Tax farming, Mr. President, brutalized prerevolutionary France. The French court paid the price during the Reign of Terror when the people were so incensed that they rounded up the tax farmers, they tried them in the people's courts and they condemned them to death. Accounts of this time tell us of the taxpayers cheering while